



# 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, July 21, 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. Persons with disabilities 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](mailto: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 7:10 p.m.*

#### **2 ROLL CALL**

*Planning Manager Wendy Rampson called the roll.*

**Present** 6 - Woods, Clein, Briere, Peters, Bona, and Milshteyn

**Absent** 3 - Adenekan, Franciscus, and Mills

#### **3 APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**Moved by Clein, seconded by Bona, that the Agenda be Approved.**

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

#### **4 INTRODUCTIONS**

#### **5 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

**5-a** [15-0916](#) May 19, 2015 City Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

**Moved by Milshteyn, seconded by Councilmember Briere, 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 [15-0917](#) June 2, 2015 City Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

**Moved by Milshteyn, seconded by Councilmember Briere, 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**

*Briere reported at the previous night's Council meeting, they dealt with several Planning items. She said Council approved the rezoning at first reading for Nixon Farm North and South; they postponed the zoning and site plan for the Woodbury Club Apartments until August 17th; they also discussed a proposed ordinance for floodplain, which has been on Council's work program for a number of years, and will likely need to be added to the Planning Commission's Work Program; and finally the Racquet Club sidewalk issue came up. She reminded them that the City Planning Commission had refused a waiver: the petitioner then revised the site plan with a sidewalk along one street but not along Geddes. She reported that Council approved the site plan but not the waiver and asked the City Planning Commission to look at the waiver again.*

**6-b Planning Manager**

*Rampson introduced a new public handout that explains the City Planning Commission and their role in the City. She reported that at the end of August she would be leaving the City's employ and taking a new job with the Michigan Association of Planning, and she will be working closely with the Executive Committee to assure a smooth transition. She said she is glad to be taking on a new job but also very sad to be leaving everyone and all the great things that have happened in the City.*

**6-c Planning Commission Officers and Committees**

*Milshteyn announced the game code for the Ann Arbor District Library summer reading program.*

**6-d Written Communications and Petitions**

**15-0918** 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**

**15-0919** Public Hearings Scheduled for August 5, 2015 City Planning Commission Meeting

*Chair Woods read the public hearing notice as published.*

**ROLL CALL**

*Arrival of Commissioner Franciscus at 7:25 p.m.*

**Present** 7 - Woods, Clein, Briere, Peters, Franciscus, Bona, and Milshteyn

**Absent** 2 - Adenekan, and Mills

**9 UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**9-a 15-0920** 2250 Ann Arbor-Saline Road Zoning, Site Plan and Wetland Use Permit - A proposal to zone this vacant 5.34 acre parcel to R4B (Multiple-Family Dwelling District) and construct one building containing 75 dwelling units, exercise room, community room and indoor pool. The proposal includes constructing 84 exterior parking spaces and 70 parking spaces under the structure. A storm water detention basin will be located in the rear of the site. The basin will be oversized to accommodate additional offsite water runoff from the north. (Ward 4) Staff Recommendation: Approval

*Matt Kowalski presented the staff report.*

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

*Bob Parnes, 2067 Ascot Road, Ann Arbor, read from a prepared statement, stating that since he last spoke the developer has chosen to*

*keep the drive from Lambeth Drive and install a locked gate. He asked about the function of the locked gate and who determines what qualifies as an emergency, and who has copies of the key, and what accountability procedures will be put in place for gate openings and closings, and who has access to the records and will they be open to the public, and who can initiate litigation to determine if there has been an abuse to gate openings and closings and dereliction of record keeping, and what court agency has jurisdiction over abuse or dereliction, and who is liable should there be determination of abuse or dereliction. He said he wants to persuade the Commission that the Lambeth Drive can be left out of the site plan entirely, because the Fire Marshal has said it's not essential. He said there are other close developments adjacent to this project with only one vehicle entrance; he asked if they are all unsafe. He said the others have been safe enough and the 2250 Ann Arbor Saline Road project would also be safe without a second entrance. He implored the City Planning Commission to address the concerns of the neighborhood and not approve the site plan with an unsafe second entrance.*

*Greg Herbert, 2058 Ascot Road, Ann Arbor, said he was shocked by the proceedings going on, noting that they spend 2 hours saying they wanted that drive removed, and these Commissioners said remove that drive. He said he is shocked that this developer came back and disrespected this community, by keeping that drive in there. He said he was equally shocked that while the Fire Marshall's report said we only need one entrance for 100 units; more than one entrance would be nice; staff wrote that the Fire Marshall requested that a second emergency entrance be paved. He said I am shocked by the way you are leading these Commissioners into a decision against the community that has for 50 years cut off Seventh from going to Ann Arbor-Saline Road, Chaucer, Morehead, and Oak Valley Road. He said all these developers wanted to connect to Lambeth. He said we told you in December that we didn't want this. He said, I personally called up the Fire Marshall today; they did not request this driveway, the developer did. He said, if this developer can listen to two hours of comment saying you can have your development but cut out the drive, and come back with the driveway, I say he is a bad neighbor, and we don't want him in the neighborhood. He said when other problems arise he will be equally disrespectful. He said what happens when this contract with the City expires and the roadway is put in, and then we have no standing. He said the Planning Commission will be done with it, it will be a contract with the City, and someone at the City will decide if we get all this traffic in our neighborhood. He said he requests that the Commission denies rezoning, keep it at single-family and put single-family in there with is appropriate to connect with Lambeth Drive.*

*He said and if the developer really wants this, then get rid of the connection into Lambeth Drive.*

*Ralph Dixon, 520 Lambeth Drive, Ann Arbor, said the more he thought of an emergency entrance into the facility and where most emergency vehicles would be coming from, either from the south, north, east, or west. He said to him if they were coming from Scio Church Road, it is a lot easier to go to Ann Arbor Saline Road, make a right and come down to the facility, rather than turning on streets and going through the neighborhood with people walking, children playing and lots of cars parked on the streets.*

*Ken Timmer, 2112 Ascot Road, Ann Arbor, said he and his wife have lived at this location for 40 years and they are very emotionally opposed to the access proposed through Lambeth Drive, adding that they even signed a filed petition in December. He read from a prepared statement, provided to the Commission. He said the plot has been zoned R1 for as long as anyone can remember as it was intended, and no other development in Ann Arbor has high density R4 next to an established single family R1 with access directly into the residential area, and City code does not require a second access, and no other development along Ann Arbor Saline Road has a second access and he knows of no issues because of the lack of access. He said this emergency access will never be used by Fire Emergency Services or Police for access; no way will they go through the residential streets rather than use the Ann-Arbor Saline Road access. He said the football traffic is a red herring, lasting 6 to 7 hours per year and is not sufficient to jeopardizing the neighborhood. He said safety of this development will not be improved with this access. He said if the City was really concerned with safety and accessibility they would enforce that the building be accessible along all sides of the building, and such a road could also provide two points of access to Ann Arbor Saline Road. He said a Knox Box is documented not to be secure, as keys are too easy to duplicate, lose, etc. He said maintenance will require the gate to be opened regularly for snow removal and it will be left open and degenerate to a general use over time, and what was initially intended to be a safety improvement will turn out to be a detriment to children, bikers, pedestrian in 50-year old established development. He said common sense tells us that this access to Lambeth makes no sense and he earnestly requested that it be removed from the project.*

*Thomas Johnson, 2217 Delaware Drive, Ann Arbor, said he is a long time resident of Ann Arbor. He said to him this neighborhood represent the best a community can offer, in terms of being peaceful and not a lot of*

*traffic, and just a great neighborhood. He said he hopes this new development will continue in this tradition. He said he wanted to address the footing drain disconnects [FDD] and mitigation issue. He said for the past 13 years he has dealt with a footing drain disconnect and he estimates they have spent \$3500 of their own money to make sure the sump and backup pump is working correctly. He said he hopes this new development does not increase the cost that he and his neighbors will have to endure. He asked if it is possible to know if this development can meet their footing drain target. He said he understands they will be required to cajole 21 people to have their footing drains disconnected, and he is quite skeptical that will be able to occur, since he doesn't know why anyone would want to do it if they didn't have to do it. He said he understand that if the developer has not received the 21 commitments by the time the building is built they will not receive the certificates of occupancy. He said he feels strongly that that they will not be able to get these and he asked the Commission if it would be possible to find the track record of other development who have been faced with similar sewer mitigation issues and proved their success how they have dealt with the issue. He said he thought the closest development would be 618 South Main Street.*

*William Higgins, 2131 Chaucer, Ann Arbor, said he has had been a resident for 48 years and experienced flooding waters and a victim of an FDD, and very little maintenance provided by the City. He said the map does not show the route the developer would like to have for access to the rear of the development, and it should since no one in an emergency will want to go in and out of this place, because the very closest distance is to the very front. He said he believed the Fire Dept would say the parking restricts the rear access and they can't get to the south side of the building. He said he is irked that for 15 months of trying to point out the family position, he doesn't believe that no one on this committee has set foot on Lambeth, with pictures in their hands, and looked at the 200 hundred trees that are coming down, the topography that is almost like a canyon, it is wet and no place for a road, and a place that directs water to the new swale; therefore, there should be no rezoning and no further work until you folks, on this committee do your job, and he doesn't think they have.*

*Peter Hauk, 2025 Yeoman Court, Ann Arbor, said he likes the access for pedestrians and cyclists on the west side, which will give our neighbors access to the publics parts of our neighborhood, like our school and parks, which we don't want to alienate them from. He said with pedestrian and bicycle access, there really is no need for a road, and should be*

*removed while allowing access while keeping traffic out of the residential streets and on Ann Arbor Saline Road, where it belongs.*

*Ruth Dixon, 520 Lambeth Drive, Ann Arbor, said her comments she sent did not get into the list. She read from a prepared statement, stating that there are many comments that point to a consensus on one point; there should be no direct access of any kind between Ann Arbor Saline Road and the Lansdowne subdivision neighborhood. She said while pedestrian access is fine no vehicular traffic should be allowed, since it has not been allowed for 45 years and should not be allowed now. She said if a second access is desired the property owner of 2250 controls his own destiny as a property owner of at least 3 additional parcels in the immediate area, and 2 that border on Scio Church Road that he could creatively use as an exit. He said the staff report mentions the need for an exit for the assisted living facility, to the north, and she suggested that the owner of 2250 start talking to Brookdale Senior Living Center immediately.*

*Judy Hanway, 2059 Ascot Road, Ann Arbor, said despite speaking out in December against this access to Lambeth the site plan has returned with the access road still here. She said we felt that we had been heard but now feel that no one is listening to them. She said she objects to this paved roadway and this development will not add any value to the Lansdowne neighborhood, but upset the tranquility and add safety concerns. She asked what would constitute an emergency for the access to be used, and how long before that designation is lifted. She said she had asked staff about the process and had been told that the developer could request amendments to the agreement so that the gate could be open all the time. She said we don't want that; we don't want all that traffic coming back and forth. She said Ascot is a half circle road and Lambeth is a tiny little road going into Ascot, and the only people driving on Ascot are those living there; therefore, having an additional 75 units, potentially 150 cars, coming down our street, when only 20 people live there now, is unacceptable. She said this summer she visited numerous condo projects around town and seen sidewalks that connect to neighborhoods, but she has yet to see one that accesses through a cut-through, and she hasn't seen any massive gates. She said she doubts the City would bring the owner to court over unauthorized openings of that gate and who would keep track of it. She said she thinks the retention pond could be an asset to the neighborhood but the City should build and maintain it and be responsible for it, since there is a lot of water in our neighborhood and of yet; none of it has been mitigated. She asked if anyone has modeled the sewer impact of the additional 75 units on the Lansdowne neighborhood.*

*Paula Uche, 482 Village Oak Court, Ann Arbor, read from a prepared statement saying the north and south setbacks are less than City code, and can cause a real threat and danger to the residents of the development and to us. She said the developer proposed is for 75 units too big and wide for narrow space, yet the developer proposes shortening the setbacks by a total of 40 feet north and south, in violation of City code. She asked who authorized this, adding that it is happening all over town that developers are trumping City code, with serious consequences. She said this is an issue that we need to address in a bigger and better way for the entire Ann Arbor City because the City is generally allowing building for greater density and City codes are being violated and too many developers are requesting variance for the height of buildings and in changes to setbacks. She said they had a fire 2 years ago, and sparks were flying onto her condo and the only reason her building didn't catch on fire was that it was raining. She said there will be so little distance between the new building and the far house to the right that we need to increase that space, and furthermore there is no circle around that entire building which means fire trucks cannot access any of that area because there are no road to access and not wide enough to get a fire truck through. She said we need an exit on the left to be truly safe from fires. She said her concern is why codes are being trumped. She said this developer is being absolutely brash in violating people, respect and there was a big study done of the whole neighborhood and no one ever asked her about flooding, and she has had flooding for 10 years with tens of thousands of dollars of mitigation out of her pocket and they have not put in a swale or valley to take the water from all of those houses down. She said she needs a swale and a guarantee that her building won't flood.*

*Melanie Raghavan, 2122 Ascot Road, Ann Arbor, said for all the reason spelled by her neighbors, she is asking the Planning Commission to remove consideration of the access road from this plan. She said she understand that 174 trees will be removed to allow for the new development and the City of Ann Arbor should ask the developer for accountability for every tree that comes down, particularly preserving the woodland along the Lambeth/Ascot side so the single-family neighborhood doesn't have view of an R4 development. She said this woodland area has been used by kids for over 20 years, and they play games within those woods and it is a really important part of this neighborhood that should be preserved.*

*Stephan Young, 450 and 452 Village Oaks, Ann Arbor, echoed what Paula said that setbacks are considerably less and in violation of code. He said the new development will essentially be in his backyard, block*

*light and affect his property value. He said he is also concerned with access on that side and asked the City to respect their current code on setbacks and to put that building back where it was on the previous codes or even further to make an access pathway. He asked for the Commission to seriously consider drainage issues since like everyone else in the neighborhood he too has problems with that.*

*Shana Wolfe, 2167 Mershon Drive, Ann Arbor, said this development is unthinkable and uncomfortable that the developer has been allowed to bring it back and that the Commission hasn't thrown the project out. She said the access road serves no purpose, and seriously impacts the neighborhood. She said from what she understands the sewage from the 75 units will be sent out back and down the sewage system built for the Lansdowne neighborhood, and that can't be allowed. She said the calculations done are wrong because that sewer was built in the 1960's for the neighborhood and it worked perfectly and there was never a drop of flooding in that sanitary sewer until about 1980, when there was flooding in the Dicken area. She said engineers routed sanitary sewer through their neighborhood and the Delaware pipes, which was followed by 3 enormous floods in the next 5 years, so the City hired a consultant that did calculations which were wrong because they failed to consider peak flow. She said all of the floods happened at peak flow-morning usage. She said the City solved that problem appropriately and quickly by building a relief sewer for the Dicken neighborhood so they weren't flooding the Lansdowne neighborhood. She said they knew in the 80's that the Lansdowne sewer was full as is. She continued that then in the mid 90's houses were built between Maple Road and the Freeway, just north of Scio Church Road, and they put that sewer across Scio Church Road and ran it to the sewer that goes down Delaware which caused flooding again, without any footing drain disconnects. She said there is no room in the sewer and needs to go down Ann Arbor Saline Road.*

*Pia Bennett, 476 Village Oaks, Ann Arbor, said she wants to make note of the impact of having 74 condo units with 154 parking spaces. She asked how that will impact getting out onto Ann Arbor Saline Road and turning left. She said anyone coming out from Domino's on Ann Arbor Saline Road and turning left knows how bad it is and she has no idea how the City Planning Commission is looking at this from a traffic point of view. She said she has been caught in the center lane, but with traffic coming out from the other side as well, there is no median and she sees this as a total nightmare producing accidents and possible loss of life. She suggested the Commission deny the rezoning and send the developer to downzone the project or keep it as simple homes which are needed*

*instead of high density where we have nothing but broken problems that have not been fixed. She asked how a traffic impact study is not required and how the major problems are going to be resolved with the density and the number of units and cars coming in and out.*

*Justin Bennett, 474 Village Oaks, Ann Arbor, said he had provided an email to the Commission, regarding a pass through. He said now that he has heard from the neighbors he agrees with them that it would be wise if the Commission considered its removal. He said a reason he is not totally in opposition to it is because of all the cars taking left out of the development and with people coming out of Busch's turning left there are a lot of near-misses and accidents already there. He asked if the speed limit will be reduced with the new pedestrian crossing and island to be installed. He said people go 55 miles an hour and will ignore the crosswalk, so it is very dangerous with the high traffic and needs a traffic study given the added cars and pedestrians. He said he echoed the concerns about stopping a fire on the south side of building with no access.*

*Mangadesh Prasad, 2122 Ascot, Ann Arbor, said it is tragedy of the commons waiting to happen here and it was said 40 years ago that when you have common areas shared that are opposed to a private interest, tragedy happens. He said he shares the sentiments of his neighbors and well documented history across the world shows unless there is evidence that the private good that the developer has placed serves a common interest to support a public good, that Ann Arbor is so proud of, he does not think they should put a gate there. He said the Commission has an opportunity to show what Ann Arbor does so well, and that is to protect a public good.*

*Patrick Blanchard, 731 Lans Way, Ann Arbor, said the traffic with a gate, will not only spill out into that area but onto Lansdowne Park, where on most evenings there are activity in the evening with parked cars there so with this proposal this is a hazardous situation and a traffic study is needed. He said he didn't believe that any one in the room tonight thinks the access is a good idea.*

*Brad Moore, J. Bradley Moore & Associates, 4844 Jackson Road, Suite 150, Ann Arbor, Architect for the petitioner, said the proposed development was before the Commission in December and at that time they heard a lot of concerns from the neighbors that they didn't want to have additional traffic coming down that street. He said even though his client would prefer to have an unrestricted access to the west, he has*

*agreed to have an emergency access only locked gate, that would be restricted to emergency vehicles only. He said it would be the person in the emergency vehicle that makes the call if it is an emergency; a policeman, fireman, and not anyone in the development that makes that call, but the 911 dispatch makes the call for which is the best route to get there. He said the only reason it is there is because there are times when Ann Arbor Saline Road is impassible; such as during football traffic. He said they proposed this because it puts no added traffic on the neighborhood streets that provides an alternative route to get to the development for safety reasons. He said they are also proposing an oversized detention that would hold about 1 million gallons of water that will solve excess stormwater problems with flooding in the area. He said they only need about one third of that for the development, and the City will use about 70 percent of it for a communal facility to benefit those neighbors who have experienced extreme flood events. He said they have been through reviews with every departmental staff, and they have modeled the sewage flow, and everyone has agreed that this meets every code the City has and offered a significant public benefit in preventing downstream flooding. He said they don't believe they are putting any burden on the neighbors because there will be zero traffic going through their neighborhood. He said the City Attorney has put a clause in the development agreement and the condominium master deed that access be for emergency vehicles only, that be determined by the emergency vehicles only, and those would be recorded with the County Register of Deeds, which is a public record. The one caveat being that the City would like to use it, they need to maintain the detention basin and the City will provide the maintenance to make sure it functions as designed and City vehicles might need to access it for maintenance.*

*Diana Crossley, 2360 Delaware Drive, Ann Arbor, said it is important to know that on football Saturdays, rules not followed. She said on the west side of Delaware where it ends in a cull de sac, there is a sidewalk that goes out to Ann Arbor Saline Road and during football Saturdays a neighbor has to block people from driving down the sidewalk to get to Ann Arbor Saline Road. She said if the Fire Marshall is saying a second access is not necessary why is it even being considering, especially given what the neighbors are saying. She said when she sees the easement to the south; she can't believe how close it is to the condos. She said traffic is horrendous every day along this road. She said there seems to be four major issues that the Commission is completely ignoring, so she urged them to rethink the retention pond, the exit onto Lambeth, the traffic, and the room to the neighborhood to the south.*

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

**Moved by Clein, seconded by Peters, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the R4B Multiple-Family Dwelling Zoning.**

*COMMISSION DISCUSSION*

*Clein asked how many votes would be needed to approve the petition.*

*Rampson said it would require 6 affirmative votes to make an approval recommendation, but only 5 affirmative votes to move the project forward.*

*Briere asked about the side setback requirements and if they meet our zoning codes and if so how.*

*Kowalski said, yes it does comply with code. He explained that Chapter 55 allows the required setback in the R4B to be 30 foot setback on the side with an additional setback requirement based on the length of the building. He said they would be allowed to go into the additional required setback as long as they offset it with an equal or more setback in another place. He reviewed the site plan with the Commission showing where the petitioner has offset the setback and provided more than what is required, and therefore it meets the setback requirements.*

*Peters asked if they need to apply a conflicting land use buffer between the project and adjacent properties.*

*Kowalski said yes.*

*Peters said since this is required, he wasn't sure if the access road would puncture that land use buffer requirement and he would like for the Commission to consider if it is effectively meeting that standard. He further explained that because of the access road the conflicting land-use buffer on the western side might not be met, but he wasn't sure how the code took this into consideration.*

*Clein said Lambeth Drive is a public street, so he wasn't sure if that would be considered R1 zoning and needed to be screened at that point.*

*Kowalski said the road is public right-of-way and it does meet and exceeds the Conflicting Land Use buffer where it is abutting R1 zoning district.*

*Clein said as he understands it the current existing zoning is that the property is in the township and it is being looked at as being included in the City with R4B zoning.*

*Kowalski said that was correct.*

*Clein said there is adjacent zoning that is R4B, R2A, R3, Township and R1C, which is mixed zoning in the area and so the proposed zoning isn't out of context. He said while it might be preferable to have single-family residential the proposed zoning is not an outlier in terms of the zoning in the area.*

*Kowalski said that was correct.*

*Bona asked about setback and the open space area. She said R4B has an open space requirement; she asked if the open space off-set for the setbacks is in addition to the open space they already need to provide.*

*Kowalski said they are required a minimum of 55% open space and they are providing a total of 83% open space with is almost 33% more than required. He said this includes that additional area that off-sets the additional setback requirement.*

*Bona asked the petitioner to confirm that the area being "moved" exceeds the 55% open space minimum requirement.*

*Briere asked about parking, noting that it seems that there are a considerably larger number of parking spaces than required and if all the parking was necessary and what was the rational behind it. She said in looking at the internal drives, he asked how a moving truck would get in and out, given the complex layout of drives.*

*Kowalski restated that the parking requirement was for 111 cars.*

*Rampson explained that this was not a fully surface parking lot and the spaces beneath the building are reserved and anytime they have that situation, they have noticed on other projects, that even though there is reserve parking available, there isn't parking available. She said her sense was that because the spaces were under the building that leaves the exterior spaces for guests and for flexibility, which would account for the 1.5 parking spaces per unit for this development in R4B.*

*Bona restated the question, that as long as they meet the 30 foot minimum, the extra setback needed, due to the length of the building could be placed elsewhere as long as it meets size, and is on the same side of the building. She said there is also an open space requirement of 55% and this project is providing 83%. She asked if this area also falls into that 55% minimum.*

*Kowalski said the required setback in that specific area is 5,174 square feet with the area they are off-setting it from is 10,900 square feet.*

*Moore said the required open space which is 55% is 22,200 square feet, and the area of infringement along the west side of the building is 5,174 square feet, which give you 27,374 square feet which is less than the 28,000 square feet of open space they are providing.*

*Bona asked what is included as open space on a site plan.*

*Kowalski said everything on the site but structures, drives and parking lot.*

*Clein referred to the planning background for future zoning for this site, noting the Master plan recommendations. He said the Master plan saw it as single- family detached as being recommended with the need to linking it to neighborhoods for school and park. He said in looking at the comparison chart the R4B required density is 15 units per acre with the current project being proposed at 13.7 units per acre. He said he finds it interesting that while the Master plan saw this parcel as single family use it also saw it being inter-connected to the Lansdowne neighborhood. He said he was looking to see if from a zoning standpoint, this recommended zoning is supported by our Master plan and Planning documents. He said from his perspective he doesn't imagine there would be a lot of people who would want to purchase a single family home directly on Ann Arbor Saline Road, so he felt the higher density, near a transit route, is a more appropriate zoning density for a site like this. He said the other issues related to connectivity and setbacks become a part of the site plan. He said he is inclined to support the zoning request.*

*Bona added that one of the biggest struggles of being a Planning Commissioner is keeping the entire City's planning in mind and not just specific locations. She said the idea of providing housing that provides the greatest potential to get to work without car is located in the City and what is located around the City tends to create auto-commuters. She said Ann Arbor Saline is a perfect example of our corridors overwhelmed by commuters; 75 units compared to the number of people commuting in, is*

*a small number. She said on the one hand, housing on the corridors encourages the use of transit, but it is also not making a big dent between the imbalance between employment and housing. She said the idea of having transition zones between single-family neighborhood and heavily traveled road is ideally something that can use that corridor, and mass transit, and access with their cars to get to grocery stores. She said she doesn't think commercial use would make sense on this side of Ann Arbor Saline and is more appropriate on the other side. She said having housing potentially more affordable than single-family, with access to transit is in a direction we have been trying to head. She concluded that she didn't think there is a right or wrong solution which is why they have to sit around the table and think hard about this, and take into account the Alternate Transportation plan, and see how it interconnects with the rest of the City.*

*Peters said the Commission does refer to the City's Non motorized transportation plan and the reworking of sidewalks to make them safer is a benefit to be considered given the speed limit along Ann Arbor Saline Road.*

*Briere said they separated the zoning to consider if multi-family is appropriate for this location, and after that, it will inform their decision about the site plan. She said she has heard from residents that they don't object to multi-family use, but to other issues of the site plan. She said zoning to multi-family makes sense in this location and she will support a rezoning without making any other agreements.*

*Woods said she supports the rezoning of this particular parcel as it comes into the City.*

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

**Yeas:** 7 - Wendy Woods, Kenneth Clein, Sabra Briere, Jeremy Peters, Sofia Franciscus, Bonnie Bona, and Alex Milshteyn

**Nays:** 0

**Absent:** 2 - Eleanore Adenekan, and Sarah Mills

**Moved by Briere, seconded by Franciscus that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the 2250 Ann Arbor-Saline Road Site Plan and Development Agreement, subject to preliminary plan approval by the Washtenaw County Water Resources Commissioner.**

**The Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the 2250 Ann Arbor Saline Road Wetland Use Permit, to remove up to 1,728 square feet of wetland area, and mitigation plan, including construction of at least 2,592 square feet of new wetland and restoration and monitoring of the remaining wetland area.**

*COMMISSION DISCUSSION:*

*Briere asked for the Fire Marshall to approach the podium.*

*Reka Farrackand, Fire Marshall for the City of Ann Arbor introduced herself .*

*Briere asked about the locked gate.*

*Farrackand said she heard some talk about the locked gate not being secure and that keys can be duplicated. She said that is just not true, and the only persons who have access to keys are fire personal and they are very secure in every truck, and needs a radio signal to release the keys.*

*Farrackand said the access road from a fire response standpoint would be important because of the congestion you can have from multiple responses. She said a single response with only one truck you have access but with multiple trucks coming in, it can get jammed. She said if you have moving trucks during the response it can get blocked so having more than one way in and out for fire emergencies is what she is recommending for that second access.*

*Briere said that one concern she has heard is there is no access from the south side of the building for fire personal.*

*Farrackand said there is no truck access, but they can walk around, drag a hose around, as it does meet code for hose lay requirement from a hydrant, so all of the code requirements for access around the building have been met. She said the truck does not have to get all the way around the building.*

*Briere asked why this project benefits from a secondary access but none of the others along Ann Arbor Saline have a second access.*

*Farrackand said the assisted living might have been built under a*

*different code, and it might not have been feasible, given the terrain to put in a secondary access; she wasn't sure. She said under the current code the secondary access is necessary from a fire response standpoint, not just a cut-through for cars. She said a locking gate would be secure from a fire response standpoint since fire personal are the only ones that have keys for it.*

*Briere said she had heard it is not required.*

*Farrackand said it is not required by code, since they are under the threshold of 100 units, but it is desirable, as she sees the plan, for emergency response as a secondary access with a locking gate.*

*Woods said some residents had indicated it's not essential and not required.*

*Farrackand said she had never said it was not essential but more desirable from an emergency response aspect.*

*Woods asked about keys.*

*Farrackand said in order to get a key released from a box that is secured in the truck, bolted in, they need to radio to dispatch in order to get a signal in order to unlock the key. She said the Police and HVA do not have keys.*

*Woods asked if the access would only be used in the event of a fire.*

*Farrackand said it could be used for a multi-unit response.*

*Woods asked if it would be used for fire personal to get to another site.*

*Farrackand said it looks like it is out of the way to get to Ann Arbor Saline Road, unless you are going to that complex.*

*Woods asked about liability if gate is left open after a fire.*

*Farrackand said it was proposed to have a Knox box padlock, but they can't secure key without taking it out of the lock and putting it back, adding that it is a time-stamped key process.*

*Woods asked where else this is being used.*

*Farrackand said she didn't know of any other permanent gates that are used by them, but that they do require them for construction.*

*Woods asked about the height of the gate.*

*Moore said it is a radius design that goes down to about 5 feet and will be mounted to brick pillars at the pole entrance which swings into the property.*

*Milshiteyn asked about snow being pushed against the gate and how that would work.*

*Moore said the City Attorney's have written in the development agreement that the condo association need to keep that entrance free of snow and ice build-up and that the snow not be pushed from the development out to Lambeth, but has to be brought into the site.*

*Milshiteyn asked if the gate would have to be opened for plowing.*

*Moore said it would be possible, and that they would have to call the Fire Department to get it open.*

*Peters asked hypothetically if during a high traffic situation on Scio Church Road and Ann Arbor Saline Road, where there is a fire response call, perhaps in the Lansdowne subdivision, where that gate would become useful in order to access that area quicker.*

*Farrackand said the gate would be useful if it was the quickest way to get to the subdivision.*

*Clein asked about the original intention of the Lambeth spur.*

*Kowalski said he believed it was to eventually connect to an adjacent neighborhood.*

*Clein said one could infer that was the intent from the Master plan; being a neighborhood that is inter-connected.*

*Clein asked about the purpose of the proposed emergency access if it is strictly to help meet the request of the Fire Marshall.*

*Kowalski said yes, the holistic aspect, includes safety.*

*Briere said it was her understanding that the petitioner came to the City with a connection to Lambeth in hand, not with emergency access in mind. She asked if it was possible for a fire truck or a full-size moving van to make the curves that are included in the plan.*

*Kowalski said staff did not specifically look at moving trucks, but the layout allows for solid waste trucks, which are sizeable trucks.*

*Briere said it looks like it would be difficult with some moving vans she has seen and she would anticipate tenants would arrive with a truck load of furniture and there seems to be lots of tight curves.*

*Moore said their civil engineers have looked at that and assured us that it is laid out to accommodate moving trucks.*

*Peters asked about parking requirements in excess by 32 spots. He said he counted 28 spots on the surface parking closest to Ann Arbor Saline Road. He asked if those spots, that are not required, were to be removed, would it be possible for a changed layout so the setback mitigation would not be needed.*

*Kowalski said it would be possible with a re-design, but it wouldn't be a simple thing, given the City determined curb-cut.*

*Bona asked why the access drive aligns with the underground, rather than going straight towards the surface drive, which would make more sense for a fire truck going in.*

*Moore said an infringement on a naturally wet area in this location, adding that the wetlands are not contiguous on the site, and they wanted to align the water run-off from the neighboring area into the retention basin.*

*Bona thanked the petitioner for adding sidewalks so there is a direct connection to Ann Arbor Saline Road and not just to the building. She felt it would be best if the sidewalk was more of a direct route and connect to the crosswalk.*

*Moore said the path is in response to grading on the site and they have to provide ADA accessible grade on that sidewalk. He said they could add a second sidewalk that would align with the crosswalk, and would not be ADA compliant.*

*Bona asked that the sidewalk path be more of a direct route before the project goes to Council.*

*Bona asked how far from the curb the new public sidewalk would be located.*

*Moore said it's about 24 feet.*

*Bona asked about the tree mitigation and losing trees.*

*Kowalski said there are 6 landmark trees being moved.*

*Bona asked what is considered a landmark tree on the site and what is not.*

*Earl Ophoff, Midwestern Consulting Engineers, said there are a total of 6 landmark trees that total 137 caliper inches and they have to be mitigated at 50%, so they will be mitigated by adding 29 trees. He said the rest of the trees being removed are not regulated woodlands and therefore don't need mitigation.*

*Bona clarified that the added tree mitigation would be in addition to the buffering requirement.*

*Kowalski said, correct.*

*Bona asked how many new trees would be put on the site.*

*Ophoff said 128 plus the 29 mitigated trees; 157 new trees.*

*Franciscus asked if the new added trees will be the same species as those being removed.*

*Ophoff said no, since they want to have three or four different species for disease resistance, along with following the City's requirement for which species they don't want.*

*Moore said the trees will be a mix of evergreen and deciduous trees.*

*Franciscus said she would like to propose a connection, where Lambeth meets the parking, to have a sidewalk instead of driveway. She said in the case of fire, they would use the sidewalk, and it would not necessitate a street to make it accessible. She said with a sidewalk you would be able to*

*satisfy the linkage mentioned in the Master plan, without the concern for added vehicular traffic and exchange of traffic across the two boundaries, while also providing access for fire trucks in a pinch.*

*Farrackand said the width requirement for such a sidewalk would be 20 feet, with an 8 inches base.*

*Franciscus asked if the Fire Department could make it work, in an emergency, and jump curbs.*

*Farrackand said yes, they could make it work, if they had to, if it met the width requirement and base.*

*Peters asked if that would be advisable in the best interest of public safety.*

*Farrackand said it is not advisable, but in the interest of public safety we would make it work.*

*Clein asked if Franciscus was proposing a 24 foot wide concrete sidewalk that would be gated.*

*Franciscus said she is looking for a compromise, for a wider sidewalk, not gated, that could in a pinch be used as throughway for fire truck access, but a car wouldn't think of using it.*

*Clein said he felt secure with the access gate as proposed, noting that neighbors have explained that people already attempt to use the existing path.*

*Franciscus said she is trying to find a midpoint for the neighbors and the developer; if that means widening to add improvements to accommodate a fire truck, she was putting the idea out there.*

*Milshteyn said the public comment mentioned that when it is football Saturday, there are no more rules, people jump the curb, and if they can get out they will get out and do whatever they have to do, so he said he is not on-board with this idea. He said he was struggling with the issue that the Fire Marshall is saying this access is not required and the neighbors don't want it. He asked if the access were not there, would it be a problem to the petitioner.*

*Moore said for the safety of the future residents of the project, his client*

*would want that connection.*

*Milshteyn said in looking at the property next door, Brookdale, he is just not sold on the idea of an added access.*

*Peters asked about parking on the most eastern side, noting that there were 32 spaces in excess of the requirement, and if they were to remove the southern 20 spots, they would still have 12 spots in excess of the requirement. He asked if the petitioner could explain the need to be over-parked past the code creating issues with the setback, as mentioned by the neighbors.*

*Moore said they believe that the provided parking as shown on the site plan is prudent for the use of occupants for visitors, given that this is an active adult community, and not an apartment community, and they will be entertaining and will have guests, so they feel that the number of parking spaces is appropriate and necessary for the success of the project.*

*Moore said in regards to the proposal of a large sidewalk, they are not opposed to re-crafting the connection to Lambeth, as a 20-foot wide paved concrete sidewalk, instead of an asphalt drive, but they would still propose to use the gate because they wouldn't want the football Saturday traffic going through their development either. He said he believed there was a way to re-craft the appearance so it doesn't look like a road, but still keep the gate.*

*Peters asked if the petitioner has discussed cross parking easements with the shops across Ann Arbor Saline Road.*

*Moore said shopping centers generally don't do this.*

*Franciscus asked if they could create a sidewalk as she mentioned.*

*Moore said they would change the asphalt drive to concrete and make it minimum 20-feet wide, and would make it look like a very wide sidewalk.*

*Franciscus asked if a pedestrian path could be created close-by the gate.*

*Moore said they would have a pedestrian path around each pillar.*

*Briere said she too is concerned about the southern-most boundary of the building, along with why we are treating this complex differently from the*

*other subdivisions along Ann Arbor Saline Road, in that they don't have extra entrances into the neighborhoods and do we consider them unsafe.*

*Ira Harrison, Fire Inspector, reiterated that Fire Marshall Farrackand had said that while a second access to the development is not code, it was recommended. He said at the end of that is also says that the authority having jurisdiction could give a recommendation regarding what she thought would be appropriate. He said the road seems to be appropriate. He explained that he was a fire truck driver at Station 6 in the neighboring area for 6 years and a firefighter for 5 years and Lieutenant for 1.5 years. He said during that time they had a run from the Station to Pioneer High School and it took them 17 minutes to get to Pioneer High School on a game day. He said had they had an access road to get past some of the traffic it might not have taken that long. He said he understands the concerns of the neighborhood but he also hopes that they have proved that only the Fire Department would have access to that road, and that the locking mechanism is not easy to go around, so he felt the present situation was the best solution. He also explained that the weight requirement for a fire truck is 75,000 pounds and as a former fire truck driver he noted that if the ground is soft after rain they wouldn't take the truck on the surface.*

*Clein responded to Briere's question about access. He said as an architect when the Building code is considered a floor, not a ceiling, it's the minimum requirement to provide a safe building, so when the Fire Marshall says that code doesn't strictly require it, that is saying the very base safety may not be required, but as she said, it is strongly suggested, or at the very least preferred or desired. He further explained that when things were previously built they might not have been built to the same standards of today. He said he would anticipate that this proposed building would be entirely sprinklered, which most of the houses in the surrounding are not, since that was not a requirement for those houses. He said it doesn't mean existing buildings are unsafe, but that our standards, what we consider safe, have changed over time. He said other Fire Marshalls, he has dealt with in the past have been less congenial than what they have experience today, but it shows that she has been open for discussion on the issue, but he feels that she is being honest with them when she gives her recommendation for public safety access it is a very good idea and not frivolous. He said he is also concerned with the resident's concerns with the possibility of having their neighborhood overrun by traffic, but he also has trust in the Fire Department that the keys are safe.*

*Bona commended Franciscus for her proposal. She said looking like a sidewalk and being constructed like a sidewalk are two different things; she reference Library Lane, that was designed as a pedestrian plaza and when you drive on it you do not feel like you are on a road, but on a sidewalk. She said what will happen is that there will be no curb on a sidewalk because it will need to be accessible. She said she didn't think they should re-design this on the spot but give the challenge to the design team to come up with something before going to Council. She said if she lived here, she would think that would be more attractive than this road that goes nowhere. She said she believed it can be designed to meet the requirements of a road, but not look like one.*

*Commission Break at 9:40 p.m.*

*Meeting Resumed at 9:45 p.m.*

*Briere asked the petitioner how the sidewalks around the gate would be designed. One concern she heard is how narrow the pedestrian access has to be with the idea that it needs to be as impassible for a motorcycle and others using it as a driveway*

*Moore said it is currently designed as a normal City sidewalk; 5 foot wide.*

*Briere asked in order for it to be ADA compliant, there is no way to make it narrower.*

*Moore said correct; they could gate the pedestrian sidewalk, but not lock it.*

*Clein said it would need to be in a level area and ADA compliant.*

*Woods said she senses there is enough concern that they may want to postpone the item. She asked the Commission and the developer if they would find this helpful.*

*Moore said they would be willing to take a postponement to explore Franciscus' idea of a hybrid that meets the requirements of the Fire Department but looks less like a road.*

**A motion was made by Councilmember Briere, seconded by Franciscus, to postponed the agenda item to allow the petitioner time to re-work the access design. On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.**

**Yeas:** 6 - Wendy Woods, Kenneth Clein, Sabra Briere, Sofia Franciscus, Bonnie Bona, and Alex Milshteyn

**Nays:** 1 - Jeremy Peters

**Absent:** 2 - Eleanore Adenekan, and Sarah Mills

**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**     **15-0923**     White/State/Henry Apartments Planned Unit Development Site Plan and Rezoning - A request to rezone this 0.86 acre parcel from R4C (Multiple-Family Dwelling District) to PUD (Planned Unit Development), demolish the existing 28-unit apartment building and construct a new 32-unit, three-story apartment building with community center on the site. Access to the parking lot will be provided from existing curb cuts on South State Street and White Street. Stormwater detention will be provided under the parking lot. (Ward 4) Staff Recommendation: Approval  
*Kowalski presented the staff report.*

*Chair Woods disclosed that her husband is Chair of the Housing Commission and said while she has no financial from this project she asked the Commission if they wanted her to recuse herself from this issue.*

*The Commission unanimously said no.*

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

*Edward Vielmetti, 1210 Brooklyn Avenue, said he is familiar with this area*

and gave the context of the location of the development as being in a triangle of land surrounded by State Street, Stadium Blvd and Stimson, and cut off from the neighborhood. He said folks living only 100 feet away in Burns Park don't consider this area and anything that the City can do to improve the quality of these dwellings will be welcome. He said while the buildings are worn down it seems to be a nice neighborhood. He hoped that people who have lived in this nice neighborhood won't be inconvenienced by having their homes being torn down and hoped that temporary housing would be available to them during the re-build. He said he is encouraged that there will be more people living there and that there will be more affordable housing available. He liked the plan of going with three stories and felt that even four stories would be appropriate. He expressed his support for the project and hoped it would move forward.

Jennifer Hall, Executive Housing Director of the Ann Arbor Housing Commission, explained that the current building was built in 1948, and they are in terrible shape. She said there are no barrier free accessible apartments. Hall said they looked into doing a gut-renovation to maintain the exterior structure but found that would not work. She said the re-build will be in the same shape but with adding features such as energy efficiency, a community center with an on-site property manager office. She said they were able to change the unit sizes although with virtually the same number of bedrooms (41); noting they will now have more one-bedroom units, of which they have a shortage currently. She said the reason they decided to go with smaller units was because this site is more for single adults and not so appropriate for families. Hall explained that all of the 2-bedroom units will be on the first floor and all will be visitable [no stairs] and two will be barrier free accessible, with the possibility of adding more fully accessible units if funding allows.

Hall further noted that the Fire Department's flow test arrived this evening, and she would be providing copies to the Planning Division. She explained that the biggest change from the earlier plan was the one-way driveway that earlier went into the property from State Street but now has been reversed as requested by the City's Public Services Department, and now exits onto State Street. She said the Housing Commission is required to do relocation for all residents who are given the choice to move to another apartment or accept a Section 8 voucher and move with a private landlord. She said the Housing Commission has to pay all associated moving costs, utilities, and access to transportation as well as counseling, to assure no current residents are displaced in the re-build process.

*Hall pointed out a mistake on the site plan comments on Page 5 [3rd paragraph] of the PUD analysis. She said the architect had failed to remove the text from an earlier template that mentioned that their target audience was students. She asked for that to be stricken from the record, since they are not allowed to have students in their housing.*

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

**Moved by Clein, seconded by Briere, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the White/State/Henry Apartments rezoning from R4C (Multiple-Family Dwelling District) to PUD (Planned Unit Development) and PUD Supplemental Regulations, and**

**The Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the White/State/Henry Apartments Site Plan and Development Agreement.**

*COMMISSION DISCUSSION:*

*Peters reminded the Commission that the City recently adopted the Washtenaw County Affordable Housing Needs Assessment, as a Resource Document to the Master Plan, and this increase in units, while small, is still a move towards the goal, in addition to adding accessible units.*

*Bona said current R4C zoning restricts the number of units to have a certain number of bedrooms and that would be something to think about when R4C comes back to the Commission for review. She said they toyed with the idea of a Floor Area Ratio [FAR] to discourage large apartments, and R4C unintentionally incentivizes 6-bedroom apartments. She said she was happy to do a Planned Unit Development [PUD] to correct our own zoning tendencies. She asked Hall how old the buildings are.*

*Hall said they were built in 1948.*

*Bona asked what they plan to do to make sure the new buildings don't fall into the disrepair of the current buildings.*

*Hall said there is a difference between how they originally acquired the current housing which was public housing, and how they will be financing and operating the new structures. She said under Public Housing, funding*

*is set by Congress and has continually gone down, and the Housing Commission has not had any control over that. She said all their tenants pay 30 percent of their adjusted income on rent and HUD is supposed to provide the operating subsidy between market rate rent and what the tenant provides. She explained that the Capital funds received are not enough to maintain their buildings throughout the City. Hall said the new structure required the Housing Commission to apply for low income housing tax credits and when they are awarded, the tax credits have to be sold to an investor, and for each project they have to get a mortgage with financing and the investors are making sure that they are fully operational for the next twenty years and that the rent coming in are covering expenses. She said the rent amount they will be receiving will be set and will go up with the cost of living adjustment and will allow them to take care of their properties.*

*Bona asked if they are confident that the support will continue, assuming it was not infinite.*

*Lori Harris, Norstar Development USA, LP, Development Partner of the Ann Arbor Housing Commission, said there is a 45 year total compliance "extended use" period that is put in place by Michigan State Housing Development Authority [MISHTA] how the program runs. She said looking into the future, they have no idea how the US Department of Housing and Urban Development [HUD] will continue, but the Section 8 program has been funded more consistently, while the public housing not so much.*

*Bona said every time she sees a 25 year old building torn down, she wants to tear her hair out. She said if maintenance is neglected, it will cost more in the long run and she was hoping there would be some intelligent solution behind the funding sources for these new buildings that would be looking at their long term well being.*

*Harris said the Ann Arbor Housing Commission has been great stewards in the design process with the goal of energy efficiency and in looking at all the materials being used so they are set up to have longevity, in addition to the amenities being offered.*

*Dr. Ronald Woods, Chairperson of the Ann Arbor Housing Commission, said the condition of the housing stock as they have addressed it through the Rental Assistance Demonstration Program [RAD] has not been the result of purposeful neglect; the problem has been the decline in federal funding that has been consistent over the past 20 to 25 years. He said the hope is with the highly efficient and professional group of individuals*

*running the program, it will succeed. He added that public housing is a public trust, and as such it is a part of a political process, which requires our Congressional representatives to hear from us when we elect them. He said it is important for elected leaders to hear about housing as a public trust, and that we will call upon them to keep the funding there so that the funding does not become precipitous moving forward.*

*Bona said it is important to know that we are getting affordable house through this PUD request and she felt it was a creative solution to the site. She said the Housing Commission's management had justified the increased density as well as the reduced setbacks and buffer requirements. She encouraged them to continue to be creative in solving what she considered the toughest problem; creating and maintaining high quality but very low funded projects.*

*Briere asked about accessibility of the proposed units*

*Hall said they will have 2 fully accessible units on the first floor, with the remaining 8 units being visitable, which means there is a no-step entrance, and the units are designed so accessible features can be added to make them fully accessible. She explained that the need of each tenant is different, so her goal on each of their new projects is to be able to add a minimum of 10 to 15 percent accessibility if they can. She said the end result will depend on how much money they can generate to build the project, but she is hoping that they will be able to build 6 to 8 fully accessible units by the time their funding source is known.*

*Briere said if bedrooms are on ground floor, what is the layout for the second and third floor.*

*Hall said the units are stacked flats, so the second and third floors have to have stairs.*

*Clein said the site plan shows 14 proposed parking spaces for the 32 units; he asked if the Housing Commission finds that most of their tenants have cars.*

*Hall said maybe 50 percent have cars, and while they don't have enough parking for their other sites, they don't receive calls from this site. She said she believes it's because it has on-street parking and is located on two great bus lines.*

*Clein asked if Hall had received complaints from neighbors on parking*

*issues.*

*Hall said she hasn't heard anything and the issue didn't come up at the neighborhood meeting.*

*Clein said the affordable housing satisfies his concern for the public benefit and it is an issue that the Planning Commission wants to pursue as a health to the community. He expressed appreciation for the design of the building and regrets that there were not more members of the public present to see what was being worked on.*

*Peters asked when the demolition would start, and when the current residents would have to move. He asked Hall to explain how that process works.*

*Hall said historically there is a low resident turn out to meetings. She explained that the Housing Commission will apply for tax credits this October, noting that this project will be paired with their Platt Road project that was previously approved by the Planning Commission. She said this will be their last new construction tax credit application, and if they get awarded [as they have for all of their other projects] they will typically be notified in December, and given the funding processes she believed they will likely close the following August [2016].*

*Hall explained that HUD has special rules for relocation and they are not allowed to start the relocation process until they issue something called RAD conversion commitment. She said she believes that happens in April, which will then be followed by the Housing Commission meeting with the residents and trying to meet their needs up until August 2016. She said when they close on the project funding in August 2016, the residents will know where they are moving and will have a 1 to 2 month period in which to move. She said currently as units become vacant at this site they are not filling them.*

*Milshteyn asked about the selection process for new tenants versus old tenants.*

*Hall said former tenants have a first choice to come back to the new building, with tenants needing accessible unit getting the very first choice. She said following that they go to their public housing waitlist with 1,200 people waiting. She said when they opened their Section 8 list they received 15,000 on that list.*

*Franciscus said she needed to leave soon.*

*The Commission thanked Hall and the Housing Commission for their great work.*

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

**Vote: 7-0**

**Yeas:** 7 - Wendy Woods, Kenneth Clein, Sabra Briere, Jeremy Peters, Sofia Franciscus, Bonnie Bona, and Alex Milshteyn

**Nays:** 0

**Absent:** 2 - Eleanore Adenekan, and Sarah Mills

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

**12 COMMISSION PROPOSED BUSINESS**

**13 ADJOURNMENT**

**Moved by Clein, seconded by Peters, that the meeting be adjourned at 10:35 p.m. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.**

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](http://www.a2gov.org)).*

*The complete record of this meeting is available in video format at [www.a2gov.org/ctn](http://www.a2gov.org/ctn), or is available for a nominal fee by contacting CTN at (734) 794-6150.*