



City of Ann Arbor

301 E. Huron St.
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
<http://a2gov.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission, City

Tuesday, March 18, 2014

7:00 PM

City Hall, 301 E. Huron Street, 2nd Flr.

Commission public meetings are held the first and third Tuesday of each month. Both of these meetings provide opportunities for the public to address the Commission. Persons with disabilities are encouraged to participate. 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 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 red envelope at the top of the home page.

These meetings are typically broadcast on Ann Arbor Community Television Network Channel 16 live at 7:00 p.m. on the first and third Tuesdays of the month and replayed the following Wednesdays at 10:00 AM and Sundays at 2:00 PM. Recent meetings can also be streamed online from the CTN Video On Demand page of the City's website (www.a2gov.org).

1 CALL TO ORDER

Chair Westphal called the meeting to order at 7:10 pm.

2 ROLL CALL

Rampson called the roll.

Present 9 - Bona, Woods, Westphal, Giannola, Adenekan, Clein, Briere, Parekh, and Peters

3 INTRODUCTIONS

4 APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Briere, seconded by Giannola, that the agenda be approved. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

5 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

5-a [14-0479](#) City Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of January 23, 2014

Approved

Moved by Adenekan, seconded by Peters, that the minutes be approved. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

5-b [14-0480](#) City Planning Commission Meeting Minutes - February 20, 2014

Approved

Moved by Adenekan, seconded by Peters, that the minutes be approved by the Commission. 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**

Briere reported that Council approved a section of the Library Lot as an urban public park. She said this section is not tightly defined on its northern boundary, but on its east, west and southern boundaries, it's bordered by Fifth Avenue, Library Lane and the elevator stacks. She said the approved size is between 5,600-12,000 square feet, with the details to be worked out in the future. She further reported that Council requested that the City Administrator hire a broker to put up for sale the right to partner in a condominium and not an outright sale, with the City retaining the ownership of the underground parking structure. She said it was also possible that a successful respondent to the offer will design or construct or provide security for or program the public park, which is written into the expectations. She said this opens the door to having a downtown park on Library Lot which has now been left in the hands of the City Administrator and the Parks Advisory Commission to determine the details of the park.

Giannola asked if the language approved says plaza or park.

Briere said the term used was "urban public park".

Giannola asked what language was removed.

Briere said that the language stricken was that this would be added to the PROS plan and remain a City-owned public park, since City Council cannot by fiat, determine whether something gets added to the Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan, and the definition of what the northern boundary looks like.

Westphal asked although it can't be mandated as a park, was part of the lot to remain in City ownership.

Briere said the City has no choice but to remain owner, and it would allow the condominium to build on top, similar to the Tally Hall, as well as the First and Washington parking structure where we retain ownership of underground parking and allow construction on the roof, with the ownership remaining as public land.

Bona asked about insight into the urgency on this site, and what is the basis for moving forward so quickly with the sale of City properties.

Briere said part of the reason is that people have been advocating for a public park for many years, and with Councilmember Eaton working with this before he came on Council, it was part of his intent to draft and bring this resolution forth in his first year on Council. She added that the City is not willing to commit to a public park today without discussing design and maintenance costs. She said development rights allow the developer to design, construct, and maintain the public park, thus providing the

funding for it. She said the rationale for moving forward to a hire broker would allow the park to be built. She explained the City now has an opportunity to offer to each respondent minimum and maximum perimeters for the public park, with Council determining which of the concepts they support, then turning to PAC for their feedback.

Clein asked if there is an intent for the portion of the site to be used as an urban park to be rezoned to Public Land (PL).

Briere said yes.

6-b Planning Manager

Rampson added that Council approved the portion of the Bylaws that Planning Commission approved in July 2013, since the City Attorney felt the Commission needed to further discuss the recently amended wording regarding public hearings.

Woods asked Rampson if she believed the City Attorney would be able to work quickly on the Bylaw amendments.

Rampson responded that since it was only a rewording matter and not changing the concept, she believed he could forward those directly to her and she would pass them on the Commission before they move on to Council.

6-c Planning Commission Officers and Committees

Bona said the Ordinance Revisions Committee [ORC] is meeting on Monday, March 24th, 6:15 pm, First Floor Conference South.

6-d Written Communications and Petitions

[14-0477](#)

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

[14-0478](#)

Public Hearings Scheduled for the April 1, 2014 City Planning Commission Meeting

Chair Westphal read the public hearing notice as published.

9 UNFINISHED BUSINESS

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** [14-0472](#) Belle Tire Right-of-Way Vacation for City Council Approval - A request to vacate an approximately 7-foot wide by 157-foot long parcel of the West Ellsworth Road right-of-way adjacent to 3975 South State Street and 590 West Ellsworth Road and replace it with an easement for non-motorized use over the same parcel. (Ward 4) Staff Recommendation: Approval

Cheng provided the staff report.

PUBLIC HEARING:

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

Moved by Peters, seconded by Woods, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the vacation of a seven-foot wide strip of the West Ellsworth Road right-of-way, on the condition that the petitioner grant an easement for nonmotorized use in its place.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Clein asked about the intent of the non-motorized easement.

Cheng said there are no current plans to construct anything in this easement area, but if there were future improvements on West Ellsworth, the City could move the sidewalk into this non-motorized easement area.

Clein asked if the right-of-way is coincident with the curb.

Cheng showed a map of the site on the slides, and explained that the right-of-way is measured from the center line of Ellsworth Road, which would put the midpoint in the current grassy area.

Clein asked about possible grade changes and how the location of a future sidewalk might be handled.

Cheng said there is a grade change and the site plan addresses the issue with steps and a walkway.

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

carried.

Yeas: 9 - Bonnie Bona, Wendy Woods, Kirk Westphal, Diane Giannola, Eleanore Adenekan, Kenneth Clein, Sabra Briere, Paras Parekh, and Jeremy Peters

Nays: 0

10-b [14-0473](#)

278-280 Collingwood Office Site Plan for City Council Approval - A proposal to remove the existing second floor of this office building and construct a 2,451 square foot full second floor for office use on this 0.27 acre site. A curb cut on the north side of the building will be removed. (Ward 5). Staff Recommendation: Approval

Cheng provided the staff report.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Ken Cousino, site plan engineers for project, said represent. He clarified the south curb cut will not be widened.

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

Moved by Peters, seconded by Adenekan, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the 278 280 Collingwood Site Plan;

and

The Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends the Mayor and City Council approve the proposed landscape modifications according to Chapter 62 (Landscape and Screening Ordinance), Section 5:608 (1)(a), subject to planting of the required landscaping materials in alternative locations, as recommended by the Urban Forest and Natural Resources Planning Coordinator.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Woods asked for clarification on the landscape modification request.

Cheng showed the landmark trees and the revised planting locations on the plan, and explained that the petitioner will be planting additional shrubs in alternative locations since the Urban Forest and Natural Resources Planning Coordinator believed planting additional screening in the critical root zone of the existing landmark trees would be damaging.

Peters asked about the additional curb cut that was mentioned and what changes had been made.

Cheng said after the staff report was written, they determined that the southern curb cut didn't need to be increased [into the critical root zone] since the current curb cut is considered existing, non-conforming and was in place before the existing code was implemented in 1978.

Peters said he likes this plan since it is always good to get rid of extra curb cuts, which is more pedestrian friendly and adding more pervious surface with turf and not having to replace landmark trees makes him happy.

Bona noted that this was a project that she had heard discussed many years ago, and was glad to see the project moving forward. She asked about the existing drive being removed and if it would remain asphalt or be converted to turf.

Cheng clarified that it would be converted to turf with added landscaping material.

Bona asked if the building required an elevator and she wanted to know why the petitioner was not taking advantage of the full allowable floor area. She asked Cousino if he was in agreement with the revised wording of the motion as read. She added that the project was very nice.

Cousino said yes.

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

Yeas: 9 - Bonnie Bona, Wendy Woods, Kirk Westphal, Diane Giannola, Eleanore Adenekan, Kenneth Clein, Sabra Briere, Paras Parekh, and Jeremy Peters

Nays: 0

10-c [14-0474](#)

State Street Shell Station/Drive-Thru Restaurant Site Plan for City Council Approval - A proposal to demolish the existing convenience store building and car wash for this gasoline filling station located at 2991 South State Street and construct a 4,250 square foot convenience store building with drive-thru restaurant on the east side of this 0.73 acre site. The existing gas pump island and canopy will be modified as part of the changes, and underground storm water detention facilities will be added. No changes to the curb cuts are proposed. (Ward 4) Staff Recommendation: Approval

Cheng provided the staff report.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Brad Cousino, engineer for the project, said he was available to answer any questions.

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

Moved by Giannola, seconded by Clein, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the South State Street Shell Gas Station/Drive Thru Restaurant Site Plan, subject to installation of a fire hydrant prior to the issuance of any building permits;

and

The Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends the Mayor and City Council approve the proposed landscape modifications according to Chapter 62 (Landscape and Screening Ordinance), Section 5:608 (2)(c) (ii).

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Adenekan asked to view the photograph from Eisenhower and asked if the carwash is to be the drive-thru. She asked about the impact on site circulation, and whether

this will congest traffic on Eisenhower.

Cheng the petitioner had submitted a traffic study which showed they are going to capture drive-by traffic and should not result in traffic back-ups onto Eisenhower, adding that there is space for nine cars to stack in the drive-thru. He further reviewed and clarified the curb cuts on site.

Briere asked if the canopy is designed for three pumps, will it be redesigned.

Cheng said it is proposed to stay and will provide coverage to the convenience store.

Briere asked about the chevron design and whether it would provide full coverage of the pumps.

Briere asked about access from South State Street.

Cheng said vehicles would loop to the south part of the site to get to the drive-thru.

Briere asked if the site would meet the proposed amendment to the drive-thru zoning ordinance.

Cheng said yes.

Rampson said the amendments are to limit the drive-thru lane in the front open space, and since this request is screened and not in the front open space it would not be affected by the proposed amendments.

Westphal asked if this proposal would require special exception use approval in the future if the amendments passed.

Cheng said yes.

Woods asked about the concern that parking would occur at the pumps, if there was not adequate parking spaces available.

Cousino clarified the location of parking spaces.

Cheng said there were a total of 14 parking spaces.

Woods asked about the kind of proposed restaurant.

Cousino said it is being negotiated and hasn't been decided yet.

Peters asked whether there will be requirements from the incoming restaurant chain for signage.

Cousino said he is not sure of proposed signage yet, but it will have to fit within allowable signage.

Peters said he would prefer to have the signs consolidated.

Cousino confirmed the owner's intention to combine signage in the same monument.

Peters pointed out an 8-foot wide pedestrian crosswalk that looks like it crosses from South State Street into the parking lot and into a pedestrian area.

Cousino said they didn't see that as a high speed area since it was on site and staff felt that was the most likely location for a crosswalk.

Westphal asked about the infrastructure of the walkway by the building and if it would be raised.

Cheng responded that the petitioner has proposed to paint the area instead of using a raised grade, given the difficulty with snow removal.

Westphal asked about the design of the drive-thru.

Rampson reviewed the drive-thru access with the Commission.

Giannola asked if there is a way to identify the crosswalk with signage, since in the winter it would be covered in snow and not visible.

Cousino said they could put signage when entering from Eisenhower, adding that they will be restricting the flow of traffic given the location of the building.

Adenekan asked about the proposed hours of operation for the business.

The owner responded it would be 24 hours for the gas station and with the restaurant it would be up to the provider.

Clein asked about dumpster enclosure.

Cheng reviewed the enclosure, adding that there would be a recycle area as well, with adequate screening.

Clein asked about site lighting.

Cousino said there are no proposed changes to the existing lighting.

Clein asked about parking up against the building and the backing aisle.

Cousino said it will be tight, but meets aisle requirement

Bona asked about the sidewalk next to the building, asking if the parking spaces included a 2 foot car bumper overhang which left the sidewalk at 4 feet wide. She asked staff to verify that this met the barrier free requirement. She said she assumed they won't be putting in propane tanks along the front of the building, since it would not be allowed, adding that it looks and feels very tight.

Bona asked about the landscape buffer and supports the current buffer. She asked if the existing shrubs and trees on site are growing.

The owner said they are growing, noting that they have been there 6 years, and they have grown.

Bona asked how the number of parking spaces was determined.

Cheng said they broke down the uses into restaurant and retail in coming to the determination.

Bona said she supported the least amount of parking, adding that customer's parking needs are being handled in the drive-thru.

Bona asked where the proposed order sign will be located.

Cousino said there are two signs mounted to the side of the building.

Clein said it would be good for the petitioner to look at entrance doors, to make sure they meet ADA requirements.

Cousino said the architectural drawings are still being finalized at this time.

Clein said it may be difficult to get customers to the front doors, to get beyond the bioswales; he said the petitioner might consider providing walkways.

Peters asked about the dumpster enclosure and if there was adequate space for grease collection.

Cousino said the proposed width would suffice for both recycling and grease.

Woods asked about the front of the building and if they anticipate having ice bins or outdoor vending machines in that area that would impede the pedestrians.

Owner said that with their larger store, they would sell from the inside, adding that it is not desirable for convenience or security reasons to have them outside.

Westphal noted that continuing drive-thrus is not indicated in the master plan. He asked staff why it would be allowed in this zoning district.

Cheng said this site has been and is zoned C3 [Fringe Commercial] and the master plan does recommends commercial use for this corner location, with pedestrian amenities from Eisenhower and 6 bicycle parking spaces

Rampson said she believed the Ordinance Revisions Committee would have a better understanding of the drive-thru amendments being proposed after their next meeting, noting that they would be allowed in the C3 zoning district as a special exception use.

Woods said given this site's closeness to the expressway, this location works for a drive-thru, as well as the fact that it already exists and works.

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

Yeas: 9 - Bonnie Bona, Wendy Woods, Kirk Westphal, Diane Giannola, Eleanore Adenekan, Kenneth Clein, Sabra Briere, Paras Parekh, and Jeremy Peters

Nays: 0

10-d [14-0475](#)

Resolution Regarding Sale of the Library Lot

Bona explained that this resolution is meant to go to City Council to offer planning advice, which is the Commission's role. She explained the reasoning behind the "Whereas" statements, covering input that has not yet been incorporated into the zoning ordinance. She noted that the City has limited ability to provide an economical impact, and this parcel provides such an opportunity. "Resolved" statements identify Commission priorities, which are similar to recommendations for the former Y lot, with differences such as the desire for an iconic design for this site.

PUBLIC HEARING:

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

Moved by Giannola, seconded by Adenekan, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission approve the resolution as read by the Chair.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

The Commission discussed and revised the wording of the draft resolution before them.

Westphal asked staff what the difference would be between an RFP and an RFQ.

Rampson said with an RFQ you would still get proposals that describe what they want to do, which would be available to the public at some point. She said the difference with an RFP is that you are baking in an additional public process. Such a process would typically include a committee that is set up to review responses to the proposals and then advise Council or the decision making body that makes the decision.

Briere said she believes the Council felt that hiring a broker would be the most successful way to proceed, given past experience utilizing the RFP process.

Giannola commented that with the Y-Lot, even though the final process was not utilizing the RFP process, the Planning Commission's resolution had an effect on the final outcome, so she felt it was important to move ahead in that direction.

Bona agreed, adding that they still don't know what they will get with the former Y-Lot. She said she is not opposed to the direction that Council is taking on this site, but feels that this resolution is important for Council to have all this information at their fingertips in one place.

Clein stated that having a broker is more expedient and the community has yet to see what the final outcome will be on the former Y-Lot, and he agreed that with an RFP process the City would have more control.

Woods thanked Bona and Giannola for all their hard work on the resolution. She suggested the word 'some or' be removed since she felt it should all be taken.

Westphal agreed.

Giannola agreed to the removal.

Resolution to Request City Council Utilize an RFQ/RFP Process For the Sale of the Development Rights Over the "Library Lot" Underground Parking Structure

WHEREAS, The City Council is contemplating selling the development rights over the underground parking structure located at Library Lane and Fifth Avenue, known as the "Library Lot," by directing the city administrator to solicit responses to a Request For Proposal for Brokerage Services for the Sale;

WHEREAS, City Council directed the Planning Commission through a resolution on April 1, 2013 to review the D1 and D2 zoning;

WHEREAS, The role of the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission is to advise the City Council on development issues within the City of Ann Arbor;

WHEREAS, The redevelopment of city-owned parcels is the City's only opportunity to require a development with greater emphasis on long-term, ongoing and growing economic benefit to the community;

WHEREAS, The Connecting William Street Framework Plan was created at the request of City Council on April 1, 2011 and 1) incorporated input from more than 2,000 participants from the public in its creation, 2) makes both overarching and site-specific recommendations for city-owned lots downtown, and 3) recommends a RFQ/RFP process for implementation;

WHEREAS, The Connecting William Street Framework Plan contains recommendations for the Library Lot that achieves the following: 1) create an identity and an iconic addition to the skyline in this portion of Midtown, 2) ensure that future development brings more people downtown and creates synergy with the Blake Transit Center and Downtown Library, 3) activate the plaza space and draw pedestrians down Fifth Avenue, and 4) develop the site at approximately 700% FAR with large floor plate office or lodging as most appropriate due to location and site size;

WHEREAS, The Connecting William Street Framework Plan calls for open space that is privately developed, owned, maintained, and programmed in coordination with building's development to create an active interaction between inside uses and exterior spaces;

WHEREAS, The Midtown Character Area Intent in the zoning ordinance states: "At present, this district lacks a strong sense of identity and is a place where creation of a new context should occur. The intent for this district is higher density development with a strongly defined street edge and active open spaces";

WHEREAS, The Downtown Design guidelines say that "Future development should find opportunities to establish an identity for Midtown, increasing its vitality and expanding its offerings. Primary pedestrian access to buildings along the civic corridor should be from the corridor street;

WHEREAS, The Parks Advisory Commission (PAC) Downtown Parks Subcommittee Report recommends the following for the Library Lot: 1) a development with street level businesses that spill out into an open space, 2) a public/private partnership in order to fund the open space, and 3) the use of placemaking principles;

WHEREAS, The City Planning Commission has specific recommendations for this site that include: 1) discouraging surface parking, 2) encouraging all vehicular access for service areas to be located in alleys where available, with no service areas being located on Fifth Avenue, and 3) encouraging an active uses (e.g., retail and restaurant) on the ground level;

WHEREAS, The Climate Action Plan, adopted by City Council in December 2012, recommends high-performance buildings, green roofs and solar ready buildings; and

WHEREAS, The City Planning Commission recognizes the sale of the "Library" Lot without an RFP may result in a development that 1) does not fulfill the

overarching or site-level recommendations of the Connecting William Street Framework Plan, 2) does not meet the Intent statement for the Midtown Character Overlay Zoning District in the zoning ordinance, 3) ignores the recommendations of the Design Guidelines, and 4) ignores the recommendations of the Parks Advisory Commission (PAC) Downtown Parks Subcommittee Report;

RESOLVED, That the City Planning Commission recommends to City Council that if the development rights over the “Library Lot” underground parking structure are sold, an RFQ/RFP process be utilized that conditions the sale of the property in order to obtain a long-term, ongoing and growing economic benefit for the residents of the city;

RESOLVED, That the City Planning Commission recommends to City Council that if the development rights over the “Library Lot” underground parking structure are sold, an RFP contain the following conditions:

- A building that generates foot traffic, provides a human scale at the ground floor and creates visual appeal and contains active uses on all first floor street frontage and open space;
- A requirement for an entry plaza or open space appropriately scaled and located to be properly activated by adjacent building uses and to be maintained by the developer;
- A “mixed use” development with a density at around 700% FAR that takes advantage of the investment in footings and the mid-block location with active uses that have a high level of transparency fronting the plaza and at least 60% of Fifth Avenue and Library Lane frontages, while encouraging large floor plate office or lodging as a primary use, residential as a secondary use, and possibly incorporating a cultural venue.
- A requirement for the entry plaza or open space to incorporate generous landscaping;
- A requirement that discourages surface parking, limits vehicular access for service areas to be located in alleys where available and prohibits service areas from being located on Fifth Avenue
- To seek a design for this site that is meant to be visible on all four sides and that creates an iconic addition to the skyline;
- A requirement for high quality construction; and
- A request for a third party environmental certification (e.g., LEED Gold or Platinum)

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

Yeas: 9 - Bonnie Bona, Wendy Woods, Kirk Westphal, Diane Giannola, Eleanore Adenekan, Kenneth Clein, Sabra Briere, Paras Parekh, and Jeremy Peters

Nays: 0

10-e [14-0476](#)

Resolution Regarding Edwards Brothers Property

Moved by Giannola, seconded by Briere, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission approve the resolution as read by the Chair.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

The Commission discussed and revised the wording of the draft resolution before them.

Resolution Requesting The Regents of The University of Michigan and University of Michigan President Consider City Land Use Recommendations In the Future Development of the Edwards Brothers Site

Whereas, The Ann Arbor City Planning Commission recently undertook a comprehensive review of land use and transportation opportunities along South State Street, culminating in the Ann Arbor City Council's adoption, in July 2013, of the "South State Street Corridor Plan" as an element of the City Master Plan;

Whereas, The South State Street Corridor Plan included a recommendation for redevelopment of the Edwards Brothers site at 2500 S. State Street that envisioned a mixture of office and residential uses that would complement existing office development to the north and provide housing opportunities for students and employees working in the area of The University of Michigan Ross Athletic Campus;

Whereas, The South State Street Corridor Plan recognizes the importance of increased density and mixed uses in this corridor to provide a catalyst for new development and support the transit goals of the City and the University, including the Connector high-capacity transit corridor;

Whereas, In the Ann Arbor City Council's deliberations about exercising the right of first refusal to purchase the Edwards Brothers site, concerns were raised about the loss of taxable land and potential private development opportunities in the South State Street corridor;

Whereas, City Council, the Planning Commission, and concerned city residents have indicated a desire for community benefit to be incorporated into The University of Michigan's plans for development of the Edwards Brothers site, including the possibility for frontage parcels to be created and sold for private development; and

Whereas, Collaboration between the City and the University on planning for future development of the Ross Athletic Campus area could result in meeting many mutual goals, including improved transit, park and ride opportunities, and new vehicular and pedestrian connections;

RESOLVED, That the Ann Arbor City Council and Ann Arbor City Planning Commission request that the Regents of The University of Michigan and President authorize University staff to meet with City representatives to collaborate on issues related to future development of the Ross Athletic Campus area, including, but not limited to:

- Exploring the creation of one or more parcels fronting South State Street to be developed, preferably privately, for complementary uses adjacent to the Ross Athletic Campus that also follow the South State Street Plan recommendations;**
- Discussing options for the relocation of park and ride facilities as the Ross Athletic Campus develops; and**

- Discussing the opportunities for a future pedestrian and vehicular connection between South Main Street and South State Street via the planned Oakbrook Drive extension through the Ross Athletic Campus site.

Also moved, that the City Planning Commission encourages City Council to revise this resolution accordingly.

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

Yeas: 9 - Bonnie Bona, Wendy Woods, Kirk Westphal, Diane Giannola, Eleanore Adenekan, Kenneth Clein, Sabra Briere, Paras Parekh, and Jeremy Peters

Nays: 0

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

12 **COMMISSION PROPOSED BUSINESS**

13 **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was unanimously adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

Kirk Westphal, Chair
mg