

**ANN ARBOR CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
MONDAY, JUNE 5, 2017**

**I. ROLL CALL**

The regular monthly meeting of the Ann Arbor Charter Township Planning Commission was called to order by Vice Chair Kotila at 7:30 p.m.

Present: John Allison, David Gidley, Lee Gorman, Peter Kotila, and Karen Mendelson.

Absent: Diane O'Connell and Kris Olsson.

Also Present: Township Attorney Matt Rechtien, Township Planner Sally Elmiger, Township Engineer Humesky, and Planning Assistant Joanne Collins.

**II. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION**

No citizen signed up for participation.

**III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Corrections to 5/4/17 minutes: On page 1 under item V.A in the 5<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> line after "conditioned on" insert "among other things", and on page 3 under item C in the 2<sup>nd</sup> line after "the" insert "Plymouth" and capitalize "road". **Gorman moved approval of the May 4, 2017 meeting minutes as amended. Mendelson seconded the motion which was adopted unanimously.**

**IV. COMMUNICATIONS**

Allison reported on the May 15, 2017 Board of Trustees meeting. The Board minutes were included in the Commissioners' packets. Gorman reported on the May 16, 2017 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting. The ZBA minutes were included in the Commissioners' packets.

**V. PUBLIC HEARING - None**

**VI. NEW BUSINESS - None**

**VII. OLD BUSINESS**

**A. (Bring back to the table) SP-05-16 and NF-05-16 - Research and Development. Determine if application is complete. Applicant is seeking approval for a preliminary site plan, Natural Features Permit and a Tree/Woodland Removal Permit for a proposed building, storm water facilities, utilities, paving and landscaping on parcels I-09-14-480-001, 002, 003 and 004, 14.48 acres, NW Quad of Plymouth Road and N. Earhart Place.**

Tony Antone on behalf of the developer introduced project team members John Curry, Chris Wall, and Tom Phillips to answer questions regarding site conditions, traffic, and R&D standards.

Elmiger referenced her preliminary site plan review letter dated May 10, 2017. Elmiger reported there had not been a lot of changes to the applicant's preliminary site plans so the comments on the previous review still stand, and deferred the traffic study to the Township engineer. Elmiger summarized the five standards for R&D developments provided by the applicant noting three specific design standards. I- the floor plan supports access to daylight, since the tenant needs are not yet known all space is presumed to be occupied versus warehouse; interior barriers

must be eliminated or moved to the end of the building so that there is free movement and circulation by equipment and material; and single stories are best in that every vertical floor decreases the efficiency due to the need to move equipment and material around. Elmiger reported the Planning Commission will need to determine if the number of parking spaces is appropriate for the use, and noted additional methods to reduce impervious surface included the reduction in the number of parking spaces and moving the detention basin away from the stream. Elmiger reported 489 protected trees are proposed to be removed which will need to be mitigated including the cost of installation per tree, and recommended a cost of \$300 per replacement tree. Elmiger also referenced her natural feature review letter dated May 10, 2017. Elmiger reported the impacts to the buffer area are very small, and recommended monitoring of the native seed mix for a three-year period. Elmiger also recommended on-site signage as “no mow” to ensure native seed mix is maintained that way in the future. Elmiger noted the application is substantially complete.

Humesky referenced his review letter dated June 1, 2017. Humesky reported he reviewed the traffic study which received preliminary approval by WCRC and MDOT. Humesky reported the proposed 200-foot-long eastbound left turn lane appears satisfactory, however, the critical queue length is the Plymouth Road AM eastbound through traffic. Humesky noted the applicant’s calculations need to be shored-up with correct numbers with regards to impacts to the traffic signal due to conflicting information. Humesky also reported there is a concept of diverted trips that may impact the intersection which needs to be investigated and commented on by the applicant. Humesky summarized the private road standards, and that [subject to Board approval](#) the conversion to a private road can be handled between preliminary and final site plan approval. Humesky reported the proposed storm water management plan provides the require amount of infiltration, retention, and detention for both the WCWRC and Township standards. Humesky also reported the detention basin is sized closer to the required volume, and balances responsible storm water management with minimizing the amount of proposed grading and impact to existing natural features. Humesky noted the application is complete, however, there are inconsistencies with the calculations in the traffic study that should be addressed by the applicant.

Chris Wall on behalf of the developer addressed questions regarding the traffic study. Wall explained they added additional trips for a hypothetical development consisting of 60 single-family homes, which is uncommon for site specific related traffic studies. Wall reported they worked through the scope of the project with the WCRC and MDOT, determined the number of trips to the site, reviewed the queuing at the traffic signal, and looked at the maximum development of future development, which overall shows the intersection will work fine for the level of service. Wall also reported the issue of diversion was considered insignificant by the WCRC, and that the intersection can handle up to 25% of diverted traffic with the hypothetical scenario. Wall also explained the trip generation is based on formulas used by the industry standard guidelines and vetted by ITE codes to determine peak hours for traffic volume.

Attorney Rechten advised Commissioners to make a final determination on the completeness of the application. **Gorman moved that the Planning Commission determine the R& D application for preliminary site plan is complete. Mendelson seconded the motion which was adopted unanimously.**

Antone responded to Elmiger’s comments and indicated they are agreeable to the on-site signage, monitoring for 3 years of the native seed mix, and acceptance of the \$300 replacement cost per tree.

Allison commented he did not find the applicant's argument compelling for building standards. Allison reported he has worked in the R&D setting for 45 years, and has been in hundreds of R&D buildings, and has never seen the proximity to natural light be a criteria for R&D laboratory uses. Allison also noted the Planning Commission asked for a tiered or 3-story building, pointing out that the applicant could ask for a variance in the case of the 3-story building, and finds the size of the building inappropriate for the site. Mendelson and Gidley agreed with Allison.

Antone responded they are following the Township ordinance that requires a two-story building. Antone stated they could put in less windows but it would not be as aesthetically pleasing, nor the way of the future as it relates to future trends. Tom Phillips with Hobbs & Black architects commented he-his firm has been in the business for 50 years, and the shape of the building is consistent with the configuration of the site. Phillips indicated a lab without daylight doesn't mean it's preferable, as people today want to see daylight. Phillips also added that attracting new talent depends on the quality of the building for today's market demands.

Allison commented the impact is enormous, the building is too big for the size of the site, and the number of occupants is too many. Gorman commented that Allison has made some excellent points, but the applicant is complying with the dimensional requirements of the district site plan ordinance, and to a certain degree you should be able to use your property as you see fit. Mendelson agreed the applicant is within the ordinance for preliminary site plan dimensional requirements but not for a natural features permit or tree/woodland permit. Gorman concurred with that. Allison agreed with Mendelson, and noted the proposed development is not consistent with the master plan or with the preliminary site plan review standards regarding natural resources and site grading, and that the FCAC expressed concern with the woodlot removal. Kotila commented the site is master planned for residential but zoned for R&D. Kotila indicated the location makes sense for an R&D building but he still has a problem with the size of the building. Kotila stated they have to cut off the top of the hill in order to have the building there with nearly 50% imperviousness. Kotila stated he appreciates the applicant's effort to reduce the footprint, but the site is overbuilt without proper mitigation, and can't support it at this time. **Allison moved to table the preliminary site plan and natural features setback permit to allow the Township attorney to draft a resolution to deny based on comments, discussion, and consultant comments. Mendelson seconded the motion which was adopted unanimously.**

## VIII. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

### A. July Meeting

**Allison moved to change the July meeting from July 3, 2017 to July 10, 2017. Gorman seconded the motion which was adopted unanimously.**

## IX. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS - None

## X. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

## XI. ADJOURNMENT

**Gorman moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:12 p.m. Gidley seconded the motion which was adopted unanimously.**