



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 15, 2015

7:00 PM

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

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. All persons 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 7:05 p.m.

2 ROLL CALL

Interim Planning Manager Ben Carlisle called the roll.

Present 6 - Woods, Clein, Briere, Mills, Milshteyn, and Gibb-Randall

Absent 3 - Peters, Franciscus, and Bona

3 APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Mills, seconded by Clein, that the agenda be Approved as presented. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

Present 8 - Woods, Clein, Briere, Peters, Mills, Bona, Milshteyn, and Gibb-Randall

Absent 1 - Franciscus

4 INTRODUCTIONS

5 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

6 REPORTS FROM CITY ADMINISTRATION, CITY COUNCIL, SENIOR ASSOCIATE PLANNER, PLANNING COMMISSION OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES, WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS AND PETITIONS

6-a City Council

Councilmember Briere reported that last night Council met in Retreat, noting they do that once a year primarily to talk about priorities and long term concerns. She said looking at where they are on their set goals for the year helps them with the process. She said the fact that they have started the process for the Allen Creek Greenway study, which will be completed within the next two years, will help guide them to get to the river and help create a great greenway corridor system.

She reported that an issue of concern that came up last night was the flood plain ordinance and while Council did not recommend that it be moved forward, it is still something that the Planning Commission will need to take a look at.

6-b Senior Associate Planner

Ben Carlisle reported that the Accessory Dwelling Unit discussion will continue at the next Ordinance Revisions Committee meeting on December 22nd at 7:00 p.m. He also reported that the Downtown Premiums discussion would continue at the next Planning Commission Working Session. He explained that Smith Group JJR was the group selected as the consultant for the Allen Creek Greenway Plan. Carlisle reported that staff is working on 8 significant large projects that will come before the Commission over the next few months. He reviewed the City's holiday schedule with the Commission.

6-c Planning Commission Officers and Committees

6-d Written Communications and Petitions

15-1476 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.)

Garrett Scott, 1421 Iroquois Place, Ann Arbor, read from a prepared statement also provided to the Commission (see attached in Legistar). He said he lives directly behind the proposed Circle K development at 1420 E Stadium Blvd., Ann Arbor; the neighbors continue to meet to discuss their concerns about the proposed re-development. He said many think that adding a 24-hour lighted canopy directly adjacent to residential single-family lots is inappropriate. He said neighbors also have concern about granting them a variance to allow them to build into the required landscape buffer and he is concerned about run-off and snow melt directly into his backyard from the proposed enlarged redevelopment of the site. He said neighbors have concern for pedestrian safety as well and they would like to continue working with the City in finding tangible solutions in meeting the goals of living in the City.

8 PUBLIC HEARINGS SCHEDULED FOR NEXT BUSINESS MEETING

9 UNFINISHED BUSINESS

9-a 15-1472 2300 & 2310 East Stadium Blvd Special Exception Use and Plot Plan for Planning Commission Approval - An existing workout facility is proposing to expand into an adjacent office building. Personal training facilities require special exception use in the Office Zoning District. No changes are proposed to either site. (Ward 5) Staff Recommendation: Approval

Ben Carlisle presented the staff report noting that this item had been on a previous agenda but had to be postponed as the postcard notices had to be resent to neighbors on East Stadium since the first time they had been sent to neighbors on West Stadium.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Paul Wisenberg, A3C Architects, 115 ½ East Liberty Street, Ann Arbor, was available to respond to enquiries from the Commission.

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

Moved by Briere, seconded by Milshteyn, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission, after hearing all interested persons and reviewing all relevant information, finds the petition to substantially

meet the standards in Chapter 55 (Zoning Ordinance), Section 5:104 (Special Exceptions), and therefore, approves the 2300 and 2310 East Stadium Boulevard Special Exception Use for a personal training facility in an Office zoning district subject to installing 2 Class B bicycle racks.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Woods informed the Commission that Special Exception Use requests require 6 affirmative votes, adding that this would need a unanimous vote given the Commission’s attendees this evening.

Clein said a reminder to the Commission is that Special Exception Uses go with the property in perpetuity unless the use is stopped for a period of two years.

Carlisle said that is correct.

Mills asked if the bicycle parking deferment would be to a point in time certain or indefinitely.

Carlisle said it would be deferred until such time that the City felt it would be necessary, at which time the City would make them put the bicycle parking in space.

Mills said she realized that the applicant is providing more than what is required overall in terms of bicycle parking, but she would hope that there would be more need for bicycle parking given the fitness use of the facility.

On a voice vote, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried. Vote: 6-0

Yeas: 6 - Wendy Woods, Kenneth Clein, Sabra Briere, Sarah Mills, Alex Milshteyn, and Shannan Gibb-Randall

Nays: 0

Absent: 3 - Jeremy Peters, Sofia Franciscus, and Bonnie Bona

9-b [15-1473](#)

Hyatt Place Site Plan for City Council Approval - This is also known as the recently approved Rockbridge Hotel located at 3201 South State St. The request is to increase building floor area of the hotel by 1,000 square feet (86,500 sq ft to 87,500 sq ft). The number of rooms will increase from 140

to 142. The hotel main entry has moved to the southwest for improved vehicular movement and visitor drop-off and relocation of parking spaces on this 2.48 acres site. (Ward 4) Staff Recommendation: Approval

Ben Carlisle presented the staff report.

Moved by Briere to reconsider approval of the Hyatt Place Site Plan for Planning Commission Approval, seconded by Milshteyn. On a voice vote, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion. Vote: 6-0

Yeas: 6 - Wendy Woods, Kenneth Clein, Sabra Briere, Sarah Mills, Alex Milshteyn, and Shannan Gibb-Randall

Nays: 0

Absent: 3 - Jeremy Peters, Sofia Franciscus, and Bonnie Bona

PUBLIC HEARING:

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

Moved by Clein, seconded by Mills, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby approves the Hyatt Place Site Plan for Planning Commission Approval, subject to approval of administrative amendment at 725 Victors Way.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

None

On a voice vote, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried. Vote: 6 0

Yeas: 6 - Wendy Woods, Kenneth Clein, Sabra Briere, Sarah Mills, Alex Milshteyn, and Shannan Gibb-Randall

Nays: 0

Absent: 3 - Jeremy Peters, Sofia Franciscus, and Bonnie Bona

9-c [15-1474](#)

NorthSky Development Rezoning and Site Plan for City Council Approval - A request to rezone this 31.7 acre site located at 2701 Pontiac Trail from R4A (Multiple-Family Dwelling District) to R1D & R1E (Single-Family Dwelling District) and R4B (Multiple Family Dwelling District) to allow development of 139 site condominium lots for single-family detached homes and a four-story, 56-unit building at the southeast corner of the site. Ward 1. Staff Recommendation: Approval

Jill Thacher presented the staff report.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Bruce Michael, 51111 West Pontiac Trail, Wixom, Trowbridge Land Holdings, the applicant was present to respond to the Commission enquiries.

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

Moved by Briere, seconded by Milshteyn, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the request for R1D and R1E (Single Family Dwelling District) and R4B (Multiple Family Dwelling District) zoning designation for the NorthSky site, and

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

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Briere asked about the calculation of units per acre.

Thacher explained that this way of calculating units per acre is how the City has been doing it on subdivisions. She said it is total space, minus right-of-way, exclusive of park dedications.

Mills asked the applicant if funding was in place for the multi-family part of the project.

Michael said funding was in place for the entire project.

Mills said she was concerned with the March 19th Citizen Participation Report from the meeting the developer had held with the public, specifically item 6.

Michael said originally they came in with a site plan for single-family only, and upon meeting with staff, whom told him it was a non-starter, because he needed to increase density so the project was in accordance with the Northeast Area Plan. He said being able to provide the density but still the single-family end product is the other piece of the market that is not being provided by other developers in the area. He said the reason they

want to phase the construction is because of how the inspection and Certificate of Occupancy process works at the City; if the whole project were considered one phase, they would have to get all buildings completely built before they would be able to have Certificate of Occupancies throughout the site. He said phasing the project ultimately gives them flexibility to have Certificate of Occupancies for each individual house.

Mills asked if the Certificate of Occupancy for Phase 1, for the single-family homes, was contingent on having completed all the houses.

Michael said no, there would be land development improvements that have to be done and they wanted to split them apart so they don't have overlapping issues with potentially partially being done with something but not being able to occupy the homes.

Mills asked about the City's process related to certificate of occupancies.

Carlisle said he wasn't familiar with the City's process but could get back to the Commission in the matter.

Thacher added that the cost for the multi-family Phase included high infrastructure costs that was a large part of the project's overall costs and if that infrastructure had to be installed before single-family houses start getting their C of Os, it becomes an expensive way of building out a site. She asked Michael if that was what he was saying.

Michael said yes.

Mills asked what part of the site improvements for Phase 2 would be part of Phase 1.

Michael said mainly storm drain improvements for water to go through the site to get to the outlet in the corner.

Mills said while she felt the plan was good, she still had concerns, as she did previously, since the plan is just a plan and the density for this project in accordance to what the Master Plan is calling for, hinges on the multi-family part being developed. She said if this developer or the next developer doesn't follow through with building this plan, then it will be hard for another multi-family project to be approved for this site, given the other developments coming to the area. She asked if there were any possibilities that the Commission could make sure this project gets built.

Thacher said, upon making enquiries, there are no such possibilities.

Carlisle noted that part of this project was the rezoning to multi-family R4B which is what they would have to build under, unless they came back to the City for a rezoning for that portion of the site.

Mills said she felt it would be really sad if the multi-family Phase wouldn't be built, because there is a great bus line that goes right there and this site is perfect for the higher density.

Clein said if the developer would come back with a less dense project for that portion it would give the Commission a say at that time; he said the possibility of projects not being built or partially being built is always a possibility but given the housing market in Ann Arbor, he was hoping that wouldn't be the case for this project, since any developer stands to make more money building more dense housing.

Clein said he appreciated the updated elevation renderings for the unit types; he asked about variation in unit sizes and average unit size.

Michael said the R1D units range between 2,200-2,800 square feet and the R1E units range between 1,500-2,000 square feet.

Clein asked if the model house would be selected by the purchaser.

Michael said yes.

Clein asked if the setbacks would be different with the various models.

Michael said the widths would be the same, with the depths varying, with the intent to create some variety in the layout and landscaping.

Clein asked about the center units where there is significant slope from front to back on site, and if they would have finished walk-out basements.

Michael said yes.

Clein said some of the items previously mentioned that they have added to help with the walkability of the site are sidewalks, street trees, and front porches on the houses; yet in looking at the provided renderings of the houses, very few have porches shown.

Michael said they are providing a large variety of houses to choose from so it doesn't look like a track house development, and some of those house options don't have front porches or have a smaller porch and they will let the customer make the decision what they want. He said he believed that since the development is in Ann Arbor, most people would want the options of the front porch and the walkability of the site.

Clein said his concern is that everyone gets a big garage out front but not everyone gets a porch, which undercuts, in his mind, the feeling of walkability. He said the variation and street trees is definitely a positive and will help to make it a richer neighborhood, and not feel like they were all stamped out, with varying landscaping.

Michael said that he felt that it helps having the garages setback along the house wall and not sticking out.

Briere said her understanding is that while the development will be putting in sidewalks within the site, those sidewalks will not connect to any other sidewalks, so the sense of a walkable development will be limited when walking past until sidewalks are installed along Pontiac Trail on that side of the street.

Briere asked about landscaping for the detention pond.

Michael said they are providing a crosswalk that gets from their development's sidewalk to the existing sidewalk along Pontiac Trail.

Gibb-Randall said she was unable to find a landscaping plan of the proposed project, showing trees for the slopes of the pond.

Carlisle commented that Sheet L-1 and L-2 showed plant types and sizes, but plantings within the slope and pond are not shown.

Michael said L-4 shows the plant types, which is uploaded into etrakit. He reviewed the site plan sheet with the Commission, noting trees located on the east side of the outer part of the detention basin, since trees are not allowed in the basin; he also pointed out proposed trees along Pontiac Trail.

Gibb-Randall asked if the applicant wanted to predict what the basin would look like in 1, 5, or 10 years, given the proposed seed-planting mix. She asked if there are any City of County requirements on the maintenance in terms of species or only the infiltration capacity.

Thacher said the requirements were reviewed by staff.

Gibb-Randall asked if there is any mechanism for tracking it to see if it is performing as intended.

Carlisle said there is ongoing maintenance and review of the system.

Thacher said since the site would be constructed over a period of time staff would have time to see what's going on and a number of opportunities to do site plan enforcement to make sure the plants that have been planted survive the first year, followed by continual site compliance, and if the plants don't do well they make sure they are replaced with something more suitable.

Gibb-Randall said it would seem that the County is more concerned with the realm of stabilization and stormwater infiltration and not the visual quality of that area along the sidewalk.

Briere said while it is not a make or break issue, she felt it should be a consideration because the residents living next to that, driving past it, walking past it and making an attractive feature creates an enhancement that is worth talking about.

Michael said since the project is a multi-year project and as it gets built out it will take several years to absorb and this is their front door in terms of marketing so they want it to look really good and if it doesn't, he would recommend their landscape architect work with City staff to help them find a seed-mix that will look good while still able to work with the needs of the detention basin.

Briere said she understood that the condo association would be responsible for maintaining the detention basin.

Michael said correct, adding that the operating budget is established with a line item for making sure the siltation and erosion issues are handled correctly.

Briere commented that she has seen projects 5 to 10 years after they were approved and they don't look that good, which led her to ask these questions.

Gibb-Randall said the seed-mix has something to do with it, but more so

the on-going maintenance, adding that the first couple of years are the most important and make the biggest difference. She said she felt it would be a point of common interest to keep the invasive species out as best they can, since it will take years for these things to establish themselves and help the system function better overall, as well as the stormwater. She encouraged not only from the sedimentation and stabilization point of view, but also from the invasive species coming in.

Michael said since they will be there for years they will have the opportunity to go through a couple of growing seasons and for their own financial aspect they will be motivated to have it look top notch. He said they are willing to commit during the construction to be heavily involved in that aspect as well as setting up the homeowner association properly so they understand the necessity of putting enough dollars into the operating budget to maintain the basin.

Gibb-Randall said they might also consider adding to the upper tier, dressing it up along the sidewalk which would be very much appreciated by the neighbors and the people that use it.

Woods asked what the timeframe was from the day they break ground to when they turn it over to the homeowner's association.

Michael said the entire build-out of the project, conservatively estimated, would be between 4 to 5 years.

Milshteyn agreed with Mills on her concerns with the phasing. He asked which builder(s) would be constructing Phase 1 and what the plan was.

Michael said there would be multiple builders for Phase 1.

Milshteyn asked about Phase 2.

Michael said there would be 1 builder since it is 1 building.

Milshteyn asked if that builder has been chosen yet.

Michael said it would be there company, Trowbridge.

Milshteyn asked if Trowbridge would also be building in Phase 1.

Michael said yes.

Milshteyn asked if the Phase 2 building would be condominiums or apartments.

Michael said they have not yet made that decision, but the high quality product could go either way.

Milshteyn said Trowbridge is currently trying to build Hideaway Lane, which is a development off Traver Road, and it seems to have currently stalled; he asked for more information on that development.

Michael said they started late last year and have focused a lot of their time on taking care of the leftover wetland mitigation that had not been done by the original developer. He explained they have stood up their first building and have it framed in but have spent more time on the infrastructure making sure it was handled, and they expect to take off this next spring at a much more rapid pace than currently. He said that project is fully funded, and the current situation is not a funds issue, but a series of sequential smaller tasks dealing with the infrastructure on the site and finding contractors that can do the work. He said just this fall they were able to get the wetland and stormwater drains in place.

Milshteyn asked if this project were all one big phase, and the building that is proposed in Phase 2 started, you would not be able to get C of Os on the other single family homes until that building was completed.

Michael said it has to do with land development and land improvements that have to be put in place in order to be able to obtain building permits and certificate of occupancies as well. He said by making the project all one phase it doesn't give them much flexibility in regards to utilizing some of the land improvement process at a time when they can start to build houses also. He said they originally had this project broken down into 5 or 6 phases and the City's Engineering department did not want them to leave any stub roads or waterlines that weren't looped which resulted in breaking the project into fewer phases based on those constraints.

Milshteyn asked if the plan was to build out Phase 1 and as soon as it is complete, move on to build out Phase 2.

Michael said not necessarily, that it would have to do with how sales and production goes, and they need enough flexibility to meet market issues as they come along and deal with the operational issues that will govern how this site is built out. He added they are moving a lot of dirt, and have

roads that have to loop, and the infrastructure improvements along Pontiac Trail that have to be done, which is a fairly large scale operation that has to be done. He said the phasing of the multi-family building ends up being more convenient than not, in terms of allowing them some flexibility with the constraints put upon them by the Engineering Department, this is the phasing they are left to work with.

Milshiteyn said to him it would make sense, and probably be more cost beneficial, if they would do all the underground work for Phase 1 and Phase 2 at the exact same time, instead of cutting into Pontiac Trail a second time for Phase 2, a couple of years down the road.

Michael said they will do the Pontiac Trail work all at once, but they have to have 2 means of ingress and egress out of the site onto Pontiac Trail, so Polson Street at the northern end has to go in at Phase 1 because of this requirement. He said the Engineering Department would have liked them not to touch Pontiac Trail at all since it just got rebuilt, but the left-turn lane requirements will mean they have to get out there and do that work upfront, at once.

Clein asked staff if the proposed landscaping around the parking lot for the multi-family building had been reviewed by staff and was acceptable.

Thacher said yes.

Briere asked whom the developer considered to be the targeted audience for the multi-family units.

Michael said there are a number of homes proposed for the R1E lots that are primarily ranch or 1 ½ story homes, with their targeted audience being the active-adult whose children have moved out and they don't have to walk upstairs on a daily basis if their health is not that good in their legs. He said the market in Ann Arbor is very diverse so they think they will get a combination of young people and older people in the multi-family building, that's why they have 1 and 2-bedroom units.

Briere asked about the unit sizes.

Michael said the 1-bedroom units are about 850 and the 2-bedroom units 1,000-1,100 square feet.

Woods commented that the units are pictured on sheet 42-B of the plans.

Gibb-Randall thanked the applicant for saving some of the trees the Commission had requested at their previous meeting.

On a voice vote, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried. Vote: 6-0

Yeas: 6 - Wendy Woods, Kenneth Clein, Sabra Briere, Sarah Mills, Alex Milshteyn, and Shannan Gibb-Randall

Nays: 0

Absent: 3 - Jeremy Peters, Sofia Franciscus, and Bonnie Bona

10 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-a 15-1475 FY 2017-2022 Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) - The FY2017-2022 CIP is comprised of updated financial data for FY2017 projects contained in the approved FY2016-2021 CIP, in addition to changes to project schedules. 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

Ben Carlisle introduced the staff report.

Deb Gosselin from the City's Systems Planning Department reviewed and summarized the Capital Improvement Plan before the Commission.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Larry Deck, 3050 Lorraine Street, Ann Arbor, Washtenaw Bicycling and Walking Coalition, encouraged the Commission and staff to give the Border to Border Trail projects the priority they deserve. He said of the Countywide Border to Border Trail the three most annoying and dangerous gaps are in Ann Arbor; where Fuller crosses the Ann Arbor River, where the intersection crosses Maiden Lane and Fuller and Bandemer Park and Barton Park on Huron River Drive. He said these projects have in some cases been planned for decades and are in the City's Non-motorized Plan and the City's Parks and Recreation Plan but they have never been built. He said previously this year Council passed a resolution regarding the gap at Fuller and Maiden Lane intersection that those trail projects should be built before or concurrently with any improvements to that intersection, so he was hopeful that could move forward soon as well as the other mentioned projects. He said the Border to Border Trail is a Countywide priority as well as a Statewide priority as part of the Governor's Iron Range Trail System so there should be significant funding available to offset costs. He said they want to make sure these projects are on the Commission's radar screen and get the prioritization that they deserve.

Rita Mitchell, 621 Fifth Street, Ann Arbor, agreed with the previous speaker. She pointed out that item TR-AT-14-01 Amtrak Station, is waiting on results from an environmental assessment and on an alternative of 2 sites for a station. She said another related project TR-AT-10-19 refers to a commuter related interim, which she had concerns with, noting that it implied a bias towards the Fuller Road Station, and felt the name should be changed to eliminate any bias. She said the NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) process should be unbiased but she does not need to be unbiased and she would like to support the Depot and Broadway bridge area to serve the community for the east west traffic between Detroit and Chicago, adding that it has served the community well for 150 years and the site could be modified to support safe traffic which she hoped could be looked at in the future.

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

Moved by Clein, seconded by Mills,

Whereas, Section 1:185 of the Ann Arbor City Code requires that the City Planning Commission annually prepare a Capital Improvements Program for the ensuing six fiscal years;

Whereas, The FY2016-2021 Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) was

approved by the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission on December 16, 2014 as a supporting document for the City's Master Plan; and

Whereas, The FY2016-2021 CIP was approved with minor adjustments by the Ann Arbor City Council on May 19, 2015 as the basis for the FY2015 Capital Budget;

Whereas, The second year of the FY2016-2021 CIP has been adjusted based on current conditions as related to the adjusted FY2016 Capital Budget to be considered by the City Council; and

Whereas, A duly-noticed public hearing was held by the City Planning Commission on December 15, 2015;

Resolved, That the City Planning Commission hereby approves the FY2017-2022 Capital Improvements Plan as a supporting document for the City's Master Plan.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Briere said the City's rail stations are not in the proposed 2017 budget, which indicated they are a placeholder. She agreed with the public speaker that it would be wise for the City to change the name to 'Ann Arbor Station' instead of Fuller Road Station.

Gosselin said that wouldn't be a problem to change.

Briere said she was curious about the projects that were decreased, specifically the decrease in the estimated amount of work on Division Street from Madison and why the estimate dropped the cost.

Gosselin said while \$150,000 seems like a large amount it is a fairly minor adjustment and is a street resurfacing that changed from proposing to take 100% of the asphalt off the street to partially. She said there are associated funds for water improvements at the same time, but the shown cost is only for the resurfacing project.

Briere asked about the Glen Fuller diversion.

Gosselin said it is a project that went down a little bit; there is a point in the Glen Fuller area where they can divert stormwater from one district to another, and they want to do some tweaking to it, but with some of the stormwater modeling results, it didn't show as much need to do that, as

they had originally thought, so instead of spending the bigger dollars, they will look at it a little closer to see if some lesser amount of work will accomplish what they actually need. She noted the engineering studies showed good news on this project.

Briere said from past issues with flooding on Deport Street she is looking at solving these issues and it is important to see the long time improvements such as Fourth Street that had been on the list come to fruition.

Mills thanked Gosselin for putting together the CIP document, noting that the color coding was helpful as was the summary of changes at the beginning of the document. She asked when the Border to Border Trail gaps are programmed to occur in the CIP.

Gosselin said while these connections have significant outside funding available they still require significant City funding as well. She said the Bandemer to Barton connection has programmed design work in 2018 and construction in 2019, which is still funding dependent. She said the whole Border to Border Trail system is not represented in the CIP, they need to go through the Non-motorized Plan to see how it should be added to give various pieces the presence that they deserves. She said for the Fuller Maiden Lane intersection there was an unexpected possibility put in front of them to get SEMAC funding adjusting mitigation but that might require participating funding from the University, so she did not move it forward in these modifications because staff are not sure the University will act in time for the City to accept those funds. She explained that if they had, per Council action, they would have added that specific Border to Border Trail piece and tried to figure out a way to fund it.

Gosselin said the Fuller Maiden Lane gap would be added in the fall for whenever they have improvements to this intersection since it would be a significant cost. She said the incorporation discussion is in the works for staff to review and decide on the best process.

Mills asked about the CIP process.

Gosselin briefly reviewed the process with the Commission.

On a voice vote, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried. Vote: 6-0

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

None

12 COMMISSION PROPOSED BUSINESS

13 ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Milshteyn, seconded by Mills to adjourn the meeting at 8:45 p.m. The meeting was unanimously adjourned.

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.