

City of Ann Arbor

301 E. Huron St.

Ann Arbor, MI 48104

<http://a2gov.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>



Meeting Minutes - Final

Tuesday, November 20, 2018

7:00 PM

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

City Planning Commission

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

Chairperson Alex Milshteyn called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

2 ROLL CALL

Planning Manager Brett Lenart called the roll.

Present 8 - Woods, Briggs, Mills, Milshteyn, Gibb-Randall, Trudeau, Ackerman, and Sauve

Absent 1 - Weatherbee

3 INTRODUCTIONS

None

4 APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

5 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

5-a **[18-1908](#)** City Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of July 17, 2018

Moved by Commissioner Sauve, seconded by Commissioner Trudeau, that the Minutes be Approved by the Commission and forwarded to the City Council. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

- 5-b [18-1958](#) City Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of November 7, 2018

Moved by Commissioner Sauve, seconded by Commissioner Trudeau, that the Minutes be Approved by the Commission and forwarded to the City Council. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

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

6-a City Council

Councilmember Ackerman reported that Council had met two times since Planning Commission's previous meeting. They approved the Midtown Condo development on South Maple Avenue at Pauline Boulevard, with a 7 to 3 vote; they approved 132 Hill Street multi-family project unanimously; they directed the Planning Commission to revisit the Accessory Dwelling Unit Zoning Ordinance to see how these ADUs can be more appealing to neighborhoods and those that need the housing; they voted to fund the Ann Arbor Housing Commission \$200,000 for the re-development of our affordable housing project on Broadway to become hopefully, Michigan's net-zero affordable housing development; additional funding has been sent to our Sustainability office to implement our Climate Action Plan (that was passed by the City in 2012). Council remains divided over longterm funding sources for the Sustainability office. Council and the Transportation Commission put forward a request for a mobility study of the Lowertown area of Ann Arbor, just over the Broadway bridge; Council expanded the scope to include the Pontiac Trail corridor, as we have commuters and new developments there, along with University of Michigan's medical offices parking expansion, all in the same area. He said the City is working with a consultant (while no contract has been signed yet) to better plan how to get in and out of that area.

6-b Planning Manager

Brett Lenart reported that he was recently able to attend the American Association of Retired Persons Liveable Communities Conference, and looks forward to sharing more about it at an upcoming Working Session, especially as we start to look at updating the City's Master plan, there are many principles that could be incorporated that will be good for all members of the community.

Lenart said he anticipates an Ordinance Revisions Committee meeting after the Thanksgiving holiday, where they will be delving into potential amendments to the Unified Development Code (UDC) 2.0.

6-c Planning Commission Officers and Committees

Commissioner Sarah Mills reported on the sub-committee working with the Energy Commission doing a Dark Skies Lighting Ordinance. She said Commissioner Erica Briggs and herself are about half way through working on a lighting ordinance that will be coming to the Ordinance Revisions Committee (ORC) or the Planning Commission at a working session before moving to a full Commission meeting.

6-d Written Communications and Petitions

[18-1956](#) 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.)

None

8 PUBLIC HEARINGS SCHEDULED FOR NEXT BUSINESS MEETING

[18-1957](#) Public Hearings Scheduled for the December 4, 2018 Planning Commission Meeting

Brett Lenart reviewed the Public Hearing notice for upcoming hearings.

9 UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

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** **18-1952** 1550 Washtenaw Avenue, Zeta Tau Alpha Addition Site Plan for Planning Commission Approval - A proposal to construct a small kitchen addition at rear of house; parking area behind building will be improved with barrier free access; new bike parking, trash enclosure, and stormwater improvements will be provided on this 1.93-acre site. (Ward 3) Staff Recommendation: Approval with Conditions

PETITIONER PRESENTATION:

Toby Headinghouse, Gray Design Group, 64 Sunset Hills Drive, Edwardsville, Illinois, Architect for the project provided an overview of the project and was available to respond to enquiries of the Commission.

Sue Dickenson, Midwestern Consulting, Ann Arbor, Civil Engineer for the site plan, reviewed the site improvements and was available to respond to enquiries of the Commission.

City Planner Jeff Kahan provided the staff report.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Noting no further public speakers, the Chair declared the public hearing closed.

Moved by Sarah Mills, seconded by Shannan Gibb-Randall that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby approves the Zeta Tau Alpha Site Plan (located at 1550 Washtenaw Avenue) conditioned on recording a roadway easement for the portion of the public street and sidewalk that encroach onto private property and recording a shared access easement with the Chi Phi fraternity to provide shared access to the parking areas and dumpster area.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

The Commission took into consideration the presented petition and discussed the matter. [For a complete record of the discussion, please see available video format]

Gibb Randall requested additional landscaping be added to the area where the two additional parking spots are proposed, noting that it would also help screen the dumpster from the side view.

Friendly Amendment made by Shannan Gibb Randall, accepted by Sarah Mills, to add an additional condition: '... and provision of a landscape screening to screen the new parking spaces from Washtenaw Avenue to the Planning staff's requirement'.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT:

On a voice vote, the Chair declared the amendment passed.

VOTE ON MAIN MOTION:

On a voice vote, the Chair declared the main motion passed. Vote: 8-0

Yeas: 8 - Wendy Woods, Erica Briggs, Sarah Mills, Alex Milshteyn, Shannan Gibb-Randall, Scott Trudeau, Zachary Ackerman, and Elizabeth Sauve

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Julie Weatherbee

- 10-b** [18-1953](#) 2001 Dhu Varren Road, Phoenix Substation Expansion Planned Project Site Plan for City Council Approval - Proposal to expand the footprint of the substation at the southwest corner and construct a monopole on this 12.87-acre site. Natural features are proposed to be impacted. A Planned Project is being requested to accommodate the height of the proposed tower. (Ward 1) Staff Recommendation: Approval
City Planner Jeff Kahan provided the staff report.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Douglas Miller, 2291 Canyon Court, Ann Arbor, said he's lived at this location for 20 years; his bedroom overlooks the substation. He said for every year the substation gets worse. There used to be a nice woodsy

area between his house and the substation, but the trees have all died. He expressed concern for big trucks, heavy industry, and continuous lights being on. Miller said there were no provided elevation plans showing the proposed project and he can't envision what it will look like. He noted that the substation is already located on a high elevation (maybe 50 feet higher than the road) and landscaping is not enough, especially if they aren't required to replace trees that die.

Noting no further public speakers, the Chair declared the public hearing closed.

Moved by Gibb-Randall, seconded by Sauve, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the ITC Phoenix Utility Substation Planned Project Site Plan to allow a 100 foot tall monopole, a 70 foot tall lightning mast, and a 65 foot tall H frame structure. Consistent with the Planned Project standards for approval, the petitioner is providing setbacks in excess of what code requires.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

The Commission took into consideration the presented petition and discussed the matter. [For a complete record of the discussion, please see available video format]

Brett Lenart explained that this site was annexed into the City as part of the City initiated annexations a few years ago; the existing structures and site would have been site planned through the Township, if they had a site plan requirement at the time of construction. Lenart said the City requires the site to be maintained as it was approved by the City, and any landscaping that might not survive, will be required to be replaced by the owners. He noted that the City's Unified Development Code (UDC) required all stations and substations to go through a standard site plan review where the code must be met.

Milshteyn requested the applicant explain what the proposed structures will look like, which they did.

Ackerman asked for verification that the proposed additional structure would be constructed on the southwest area of the site. He requested the petitioner to review the landscaping plan, and their long term plan for keeping landscaping alive.

The petitioner reviewed the landscaping plan with the Commission.

Gibb-Randall suggested that the proposed arborvitae be replaced with other species since the deer will likely consume it all within the first winter; she noted that the proposed tree species were also smaller in stature, while she preferred to see taller species that would help with the screening.

Cynthia Stump, Project Manager for the Petitioner, explained that DTE has owned and operated the substation since 1968 and when ITC was sold, they acquired the high voltage equipment from DTE. She said ITC agrees with the Commission that trees that have died need to be replaced adding they are in favor of the right trees in the right place. Stump said each proposed tree and location is determined by asset: overhead equipment and underground transmission lines. She said they can't have trees on the western side, because there is a transmission line coming into the site from this direction, and they can't have trees under their power lines. She said their long term plan is to keep the trees and landscaping alive.

Ackerman noted that the proposed stormwater system will be able to mitigate the 100-year storm. He requested the petitioner review the system with the Commission, which they did, explaining their infiltration system was reviewed and approved by the Washtenaw County Water Resource Commissioner; a gravel pad and or crushed gravel system is standard use in their substations. The added weep holes in the new retaining wall is something new for them.

Ackerman enquired if the petitioner has seen a need to increase their systems throughout the State due to increased storm events.

Stump explained they always meet the required storm events, depending on the floodplains in the area of their stations. She said if they begin to see water-pooling on their sites, their Engineer team works with the local jurisdiction to determine the cause. She said the cause for added run-off is usually new development in the vicinity, while in her 15 years of service in the industry she has never seen a whole site water-pooled. She believes it is because they construct their stations at a higher elevation, specifically for this reason. Stump said they do constant inspections of their asset sites as well.

Gibb-Randall noted existing erosion on the southern side, pitching towards the retaining wall. She said with Traver Creek being right there, how will grading be done. Gibb-Randall said she would like to know that

there will be an active eye on the hill erosion on the site.

The petitioner's Engineer explained that since the floodplain goes right up to the base of the hill it leaves them without many options. They said they have fulfilled all requirements and codes.

Mills asked about lighting of the site, pointing out that a minimally lit site would make them good neighbors as well as help them abide by the City's code.

Briggs asked about possible camouflage of the monopole.

Stump said the standard in Michigan, for the monopoles, is to use steel given the amount of grey days here. She said they don't paint them any specific color.

Sauve asked about the timeline for the proposed temporary bridge, and what measures will they take for ruts left by trucks

The petitioner's Project Manager said it the temporary bridge would be installed for access across Traver Creek to put in the monopole and remove any vegetation that needs to be removed – possibly 2 months or less. He said they would mat any ruts left by trucks, which is on their Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) permit. The impacts to the hill will be as minimal as possible.

Woods asked about noise on the site and if the additional equipment will make the site noisier. She also asked about ownership of the site and if the proposed project will provide better service to that area of the City. She asked if the existing noise from the site is within the City's noise ordinance.

The petitioner said the new equipment would not add any additional noise to the site, noting that noise is usually created by the hum of transformers. They explained that ITC Holdings Corporation and DTE will collaborate their services on this substation; ITC will own the high voltage equipment while DTE owns the transformers, and the goal of these improvements is to provide better capacity which results in less outages.

Jeff Kahan responded that the existing noise as well as construction noise from the site would need to be in accordance with the City's noise ordinance. He said the hum does not come close to the 60 decibel noise limit per City code.

The petitioner said there will be a 24/7 phone contact number provided on the site for anyone to call with complaints and enquiries.

Woods enquired about the transmission lines coming into the site, and if construction had begun or would begin.

The petitioner said they are wrapping up construction by Dhu Varren and Nixon Roads, and restoration has been completed.

Milshteyn said the only way he would feel comfortable with supporting this project, he would like to add a condition that ITC address the erosion, instead of running directly into Traver Creek. He said we have one shot to address this now and if we don't it won't be looked at.

Gibb-Randall said the site is too steep to allow infiltration they would like to see, but erosion repair is possible.

Woods expressed support for a postponement to allow WCWRC to weigh in on the issue, given the complicity involved.

Milshteyn asked how a postponement would affect the project.

Lenart said he wasn't sure if a postponement could solve the issue; however if the Commission felt comfortable, they could require ITC provide information to staff, to allow them to vet their approach, as this project progresses to City Council, they can assure that issue is addressed. He said the requirement would include soil erosion repair and maintenance measures that are mitigated over the long term, above and beyond the City's site plan review requirements.

Woods said she felt comfortable with staff's approach.

Lenart noted that another provision added to this Planned Project Site Plan also further adds satisfaction of the requirement of a Planned Project, going above and beyond the minimum WCWRC standards, potentially, and our steep slope standards, potentially, thereby being another justification the Commission, and ultimately City Council, could consider

Moved by Gibb Randall, seconded by Mills, that ITC provide details that address soil erosion repair and long term maintenance of such area, the potential of redirection of stormwater; revisit evergreen species along eastern boundary.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT:

On a roll call vote, the vote was as follows, with the Chair declaring the amendment carried. Vote: 8-0

Yeas: 8 - Wendy Woods, Erica Briggs, Sarah Mills, Alex Milshteyn, Shannan Gibb-Randall, Scott Trudeau, Zachary Ackerman, and Elizabeth Sauve

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Julie Weatherbee

CONTINUED COMMISSION DISCUSSION ON MAIN MOTION:

Briggs enquired if there was a need for the chainlink fence to be transparent or if a green fence could be used.

The petitioner said it was their standard to use a transparent chain-link fence for security reasons.

Mills asked for clarification on the motion.

Lenart said the intention is to answer these questions about the special along the eastern boundary and the stormwater potential, soil erosion stabilization, so that when the project progresses to City Council the issues were answered per your direction before such time, and not just let the issues keep moving on.

Mills said she felt that the soil erosion is the project benefit – the trade off. She said a Planned Project in exchange to meeting some of the criteria above what we usually require, such as a height limit that exceeds our requirement, preserving natural features. She said being a good steward by preserving Traver Creek is the preserving natural features benefit here, and it's really important that we not do the easy thing, but the right thing, if it is possible. She expressed support for the project moving forward to Council, if, her concerns could be incorporated into such a transmittal.

Staff acknowledged her request.

VOTE ON MAIN MOTION:

On a roll call vote, the vote was as follows, with the Chair declaring the amended motion carried. Vote: 8-0

Yeas: 8 - Wendy Woods, Erica Briggs, Sarah Mills, Alex Milshteyn, Shannan Gibb-Randall, Scott Trudeau, Zachary Ackerman, and Elizabeth Sauve

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Julie Weatherbee

10-c [18-1954](#) Proposed Text Amendments to Chapter 55 Unified Development Code (UDC) to establish requirements to allow mobile food vendors in defined circumstances on privately owned property in the City of Ann Arbor. Staff Recommendation: Approval

Planning Manager Brett Lenart provided the background on the proposed amendment.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Noting no public speakers, the Chair declared the public hearing closed.

Moved by Scott Trudeau, seconded by Zach Ackerman, that the Planning Commission recommends that the Mayor and City Council approved amendments to the Chapter 55 (Article VIII Mobile Food Vending Services) – Unified Development Code as presented.

Proposed UDC Amendments:

Add New Definition to Article VIII: Definitions, 5.37.2 Specific Terms

Mobile Food Vending Service

Any vehicle or trailer, designed to be portable and not permanently attached to the ground, from which food is prepared and/or sold, and licensed under the Michigan Food Law of 2000, as amended.

Add New Provisions to Article III: Use Regulations, 5.16.6 Accessory Uses and Structures

Mobile Food Vending Service

(1) Mobile Food Vending Services shall meet the following requirements:

a. The Mobile Food Vending Service and associated fixtures shall not be located less than 10 feet to any public right of way or within

any required sight distance triangle.

On a property adjacent to any Residential Zoning District, the Mobile Food Vending Service shall not be located within the required setback established by the zoning district immediately adjacent to the residentially zoned district.

b. Any operator of a Mobile Food Vending Service must receive a Zoning Compliance Permit annually and display at service. All applications for Zoning Compliance Permit must include documentation of property owner permission for any proposed location, which may be amended over course of permit term, and Washtenaw County or other applicable Health Department approval.

c. Trash and recycling receptacles must be provided for customers to dispose of waste. Such receptacle shall be located no more than ten (10) feet from the mobile food vendor.

d. The Mobile Food Vending Service is responsible for removing all associated solid and liquid trash, litter, and refuse from the site at the end of each business day. This includes food wrappers, food utensils, paper products, cans, bottles, food, wastewater, grease, oil and other such waste generated by the mobile food vendor or discarded improperly by customers.

e. Up to one Mobile Food Vending Service may occupy a property with an improved parking area of 10 or fewer parking spaces. Mobile Food Vending Service may occupy other properties at a rate not to exceed one Mobile Food Vending Service per 10 parking spaces, or fraction thereof, at a single time.

f. A Mobile Food Vending Service shall not present any parking, traffic, vehicular accessibility or pedestrian or other non-motorized conflicts or impediments on the property. A Mobile Food Vending Service shall not block or obstruct any fire lanes. A Mobile Food Vending Service shall not violate any provisions of the local or State Building Codes.

Add Mobile Food Vending Service to Article III: Use Regulations, Table 5-15 as Accessory Use in all Mixed Use and Non-Residential/Special Purpose Districts

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

The Commission took into consideration the presented petition and discussed the matter. [For a complete record of the discussion, please see available video format]

Ackerman expressed his appreciation to Lenart and staff for putting the Commission's thoughts together, noting that the amendment was a great framework. He asked about outreach to those whom had previously provided their feedback on the subject.

Lenart explained that approximately a dozen names and email addresses had been provided at the Ordinance Revisions Committee meeting; those folks were notified that this item would be appearing on the agenda tonight. All Commercial Associations as well as all Registered Neighborhood Associations were provided notice, in addition to the Public Notice in the publication. He said based on that, I heard some questions from a downtown association, but never received any feedback and then from one individual whom expressed skepticism, that staff's intention was to somehow penalize local businesses; they were specifically asking about the operation of an existing facility and whether that would be compliant under these proposed provisions. Lenart said he had conveyed that he did not know the answer to the individual's question, since he had not done an analysis of any particular sites; Lenart's intention was not to legitimize one but rather find the ordinance language that might accommodate these uses appropriately in the City.

Ackerman expressed some nervousness with the possibility of zoning the existing operational vendors out of compliance; however, he was comfortable with the amendment, since he is familiar with the conversations that have gone into it. He greatly appreciated the density recommendation be based on a linear sliding scale.

Lenart commented that the Commission should keep in mind that they [mobile vendors] are not provided for now and we wouldn't be rendering any 'out of compliance'.

Briggs expressed support for the amendment, that it was a reflection of a good public process, from what had originally been proposed to this amendment, with moving slowly and providing ample time for feedback. She asked if the existing route would still be available.

Lenart said any site could seek outdoor sales through a Special Exception Use, so you wouldn't have to go through this provision if they

wanted, for example, to look for the use that complied with some different set of criteria. He explained that provision would still apply to non-mobile food providers.

Mills agreed with the Commission, and expressed being very comfortable with the proposed amendment because it wasn't a setback distance, but instead it speaks to what you are planting along the way [conflicting land use buffers].

On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

Vote: 8-0

Yeas: 8 - Wendy Woods, Erica Briggs, Sarah Mills, Alex Milshteyn, Shannan Gibb-Randall, Scott Trudeau, Zachary Ackerman, and Elizabeth Sauve

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Julie Weatherbee

- 10-d** [18-1955](#) Proposed Text Amendments to Chapter 55 Unified Development Code (UDC) Article IV: Development Standards, Section 5.18 Special Dimensional and Site Layout Standards of the Ann Arbor City Code to enable the encroachment of covered front porches, decks, and platforms into the required front setback. Staff Recommendation: Approval
Planning Manager Brett Lenart provided the background on the proposed amendment.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Noting no public speakers, the Chair declared the public hearing closed.

Proposed UDC Amendments:

Add New Provisions to Article IV: Use Regulations, 5.18.1 (C) Special Dimensional and Site Layout Standards, Exceptions

Front Porch Setback Exception

1. Unenclosed porches, decks and platforms covered by a roof or canopy which do not extend above the first floor of a residential structure, nor extend more than eight feet in depth from any point along the principal building, and located in an R1A, R1B, R1C, R1D, R1E, R2A or R4C district may project up to eight feet into the required front setback.

No unenclosed porch, deck or platform shall be located within five feet from the front property line. For premises on which such encroachment occurs, the principal front elevation will continue to establish the existing front setback.

Moved by Mills, seconded by Woods, that the Planning Commission recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve amendments to the Chapter 55 (Article IV Front Porch Setback Exception) Unified Development Code as presented.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

The Commission took into consideration the presented petition and discussed the matter. [For a complete record of the discussion, please see available video format]

Milshteyn explained that he had the honor of serving as the Chairperson of the Zoning Board of Appeals for four years, as well as serving on the ZBA for a couple more years before that, and this issue was on our agenda on a very regular basis. He expressed support and appreciation to see this proposed amendment, noting it will alleviate a lot of anxiety and financial burden that's put on our residents who just want to make their homes beautiful and who want to be a bigger part of their neighborhood. Milshteyn said this amendment is long overdue and I'm so happy staff have come forward with this.

Trudeau asked why R2B and other R4 zoning districts weren't included.

Lenart answered that he believed in the other districts there might be more prevalence of high density or group housing, and it came down to trying to find a balance or where these petitions for variances come from along with land use pattern.

Trudeau expressed some ambiguity with the last sentence of the proposed amendment.

AMENDMENT:

Moved by Sarah Mills, seconded by Scott Trudeau to strike last sentence of proposed UDC amendment.

AMENDED TEXT:

**Add New Provisions to Article IV: Use Regulations, 5.18.1 (C)
Special Dimensional and Site Layout Standards, Exceptions**

Front Porch Setback Exception

1. Unenclosed porches, decks and platforms covered by a roof or canopy which do not extend above the first floor of a residential structure, nor extend more than eight feet in depth from any point along the principal building, and located in an R1A, R1B, R1C, R1D, R1E, R2A or R4C district may project up to eight feet into the required front setback. No unenclosed porch, deck or platform shall be located within five feet from the front property line.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT:

On a voice vote the Chair declared the amendment carried.

CONTINUED COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

The Commission took into consideration the presented petition and discussed the matter. [For a complete record of the discussion, please see available video format]

Mills noted that this amendment is a good thing, because we want people to have porches.

Lenart explained that the intent is that this would apply to new structures; we would have some record of them, because they would have to invoke this standard as part of our approval or it would just be after the date of adoption.

Gibb-Randall enquired if porch steps were included in the calculation. She also asked where the eight-foot depth originated.

Lenart said, no, our current code is silent on steps, which can be located anywhere on a property. He explained that staff put a lot of thought and research into the depth; what is needed for a table and chairs with enough space for passage on a porch, how would this impact a 1960's neighborhood ranch house, it was trying to find a balance of something that seemed plausible and useable but not too excessive or driving too far from an encroachment perspective. When questioned if aerials had been used of existing neighborhoods, he clarified, that staff did not look at aerials it was more about our perceived usability of dimensions.

VOTE ON MAIN MOTION:

On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

Vote: 8-0

Yeas: 8 - Wendy Woods, Erica Briggs, Sarah Mills, Alex Milshteyn, Shannan Gibb-Randall, Scott Trudeau, Zachary Ackerman, and Elizabeth Sauve

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Julie Weatherbee

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

None

12 COMMISSION PROPOSED BUSINESS

Chair Milshteyn wished the public and Commission a Happy Thanksgiving.

13 ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Sarah Mills, seconded by Erica Briggs, to adjourn the meeting at 9:30 pm. The motion passed unanimously.

Alex Milshteyn, 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 Thursdays at 8:00 AM and Saturdays at 8:00 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.