

Downtown Zoning Evaluation: Community Meeting Feedback	
Date: August 5th, 2013 Location: 200 N. Main, Lower Level	
Ann St. Parcel	Feedback
Is D1 zoning appropriate for the Consensus to reevaluate	Straw poll - 4 out of 4 for reevaluation
	Create a buffer - change to D2 (4 out of 4)
	1 sticker dot vote
	Extend to NW corner of Huron/Division
	D2 should continue down Huron from State to city hall
	Should consider making parking lot on Ann into something less than D2 - perhaps office to protect corner of Ann and Division
	D2, R4C
	Need to protect historic district
	D1 has nearby residential homes in historic 4th ward, mix of residential with student housing - D1 inappropriate next to residential
	Want more open space
	Other alternative between D1 and D2
	DDA affordable to get Washington & has 8 stories + parking
	Straw poll - 5 out of 5 for downzone to D2
	Downzone to park!
	D2 adjacent to city hall (3 sticker dot votes)
	Ann St. parking D2
	R4C on Ann St. frontage Not D1 on Huron St.
	Another planned project zone (north side is not as homogeneous as south) adjacencies more complex
	Better design guidelines - standards
	D2 might be more palatable - when paired with design of ds
	Enable zoning and standards with models of HDC
	See Birmingham design standards
	Sentiment to require adherence to overlay districts

Downtown Zoning Evaluation: Community Meeting Feedback
Date: August 5th, 2013 Location: 200 N. Main, Lower Level

Huron Street Site	Feedback
Is D1 zoning appropriately located	2 sticker dot votes for reevaluation
Consensus to create a buffer	Create buffer north of Huron - change to D2 (4 out of 4)
Concern for building height near residential and obstructed sunlight for residential	4 Yeses - D1 on Huron should be changed
	Should be either D2 or hybrid of D2 - need to buffer to residential - from State to 5th
	Should define setback below grade and consider setback limits below ground because below grade affects natural features in adjacent zones and other disturbances to adjacent properties. Process of mitigation does not protect natural features. Developers should not be able to hire the evaluator
D1 setbacks discussed	Zoning should be a protection for solar access - ratio of height and mass should incorporate solar access
	Better pedestrian protection - compromised by D1 zoning on Huron
	D2 north of Huron (3 sticker dot votes)
	Inflexible designations
	Buffer definitely needed at residential
	D2 or D2 hybrid
	Below grade setback same as above grade
	Straw poll - 4 out of 4 for reevaluation
	Below grade setback should: protect natural features, protect personal property, protect solar access - step down mass
	D2 to create buffer
	Again sunlight / wind effects
	Front setbacks on D1
	Straw poll - 5 out of 5 said we need to rezone
	Look at Paris - no area is more than 8 stories high
	Why do we need 150 feet high buildings?
	Consider neighborhood districts - especially historic districts - give equal consideration to them - immediately adjacent properties to historic districts need to get approved from the HDC
	Greater protection for historic district
	Buffer zones between D1 and neighborhoods
	All edges of D1 should have D2 zoning

Huron St. Site

Huron Street Site	Feedback
	Setbacks near major thoroughfares should be increased
	Use greenbelt monies to buy
	D1/D2 lands to increase green space - green area around the building
	D2 on south side too
	Wind canyon effects
	Campus Inn and Sloan have good setbacks
	Remember sunlight for existing bldgs.
	PUD has advantaged
	continue D2 north of Huron: what about office? maybe continue D2 thru to Ann St
	D2
	Step down to north?
	All as PUD? Pre-zoned PUD of block on Division w. UM bldgs.
	Enforceable design guidelines
	Revise D2 - D2.5? Completely different kind of contextual perhaps form based zoning

Downtown Zoning Evaluation: Community Meeting Feedback	
Date: August 5th, 2013	Location: 200 N. Main, Lower Level
William Street Site	Feedback
Is D1 zoning appropriately located on the south side of William Street	Possible 30 - 40 feet max?allow procedure for variances
	Light important - critical to property values
	Straw poll - 5 out of 5 want to rezone to D2
Consensus to rezone to D2	Green area around the building - All areas adjacent to residential areas should have a green buffer
	3 sticker dot votes for reevaluation
	Straw poll - 4 out of 4 to rezone to D2
Concern for abutting residential	Extend to Packard
	Create buffer between residential
	D1 at Main and William - 3 sticker dot votes for reevaluation
	Continue D2 west to Main and south to Packard
	Open space along William - pocket parks
	Should not be D1; at least D2 abut residential area could be 80 or 100 ft. not 150 (14 stories)
	North side of William should be less than D1
	Need D2 next to residential - buffer
	Downtown is not that tall
	Negative affects city lots on N. side - sunlight
	DTE lot south of William - D2 to not negatively impact city properties
	Adjacencies to HDs are of concern - HDC controls?
	Roles of overlay districts (mandatory compliance)
	Assume impermanence of existing buildings
	How to protect against worst case scenarios?
	R4C?
	Contextual design
	Codify adjacent
	Planning and zoning disconnected
	Orientation (bldg.) is not addressed 2D!
	Need build out models - use vs. size (area, ht., mass)

Premiums

Downtown Zoning Evaluation: Community Meeting Feedback Date: August 5th, 2013 Location: 200 N. Main, Lower Level	
Premiums	Feedback
Do D1 residential FAR premiums effectively encourage a diverse	Keep residential premiums (2 sticker dot votes)
	LEED - change for better cost/benefit
Premiums should be better defined - suggested as requirements	Large plate office - add to encourage more (2 sticker dot votes)
	Retail premium to encourage more
Consensus premiums have unexpected results - many feel not getting what they want	Premiums don't work - unexpected results (3 sticker dot votes)
	Raise the bar - require the things we want
Premiums for open green space on ground level suggested	Premiums are not encouraging a diverse downtown - only developments have been student apts.
	One option is that incentives (premiums) are a requirement.
Mix about residential premiums - agreed too much student housing	Do not use premiums to only add height
	If premiums are allowed, standards should be really high
Better premiums for affordable housing	Consider giving reverse premiums
	Require that more than one premium to be met in order to reach the height limit set by zoning.
	Premiums: do not allow added height "by right" (#5)
	Premiums are NOT encouraging a diverse downtown population
	Make the incentives a requirement. do not use added height as premiums - require aesthetics in design review historic pres. must be high standard do not sanction things we don't want if not met, reduce project size reduce max. heights in D1 & D2 choose min. no. incentives
	Straw poll - 5 out of 5 for reevaluation
	Premiums are bogus excuses to let developers do whatever they want
	Remove all premiums
	Creates complexity and confusion

Premiums

Premiums	Feedback
	Make a distinction between student housing and other housing - e.g. limit multi-family units
	Remove premiums for 5 bedroom/4 bedroom units
	All new buildings should be LEED certified and no premiums allowed
	Parking should be part of the building and no additional premiums for that
	Take the tax burden off the properties instead of using premiums for affordable
	redefine affordability - not the current 80% of AMI
	Pedestrian amenities required and not premiums
	Incentivize pedestrian amenities
	Diverse housing - affordable housing (cost per unit)
	Preservation/protection of historic/resources and existing residential areas
	Open green space - accessible to public - on ground level
	Premiums should only be given to developments not following design guideline recommendations
	LEED certification
	Don't give premiums for general housing
	Give premiums for things that we want - affordable housing (vs. any housing). Define what we want - open space (on ground level - open/accessible to public and maintained by owner of bldg.)
	What do we mean by diverse?
	Residential is not appropriate for a premium at all
	Premiums not working - Student houses are turning over, downtown doesn't have services residents need
	Need numbers on populations and demographics to determine whether they are working
	Used as an excuse for bigger bldg. abused - no public benefit

Premiums

Premiums	Feedback
	Get rid of some - energy efficiency is good though
	Outward result is large, shadowy building
	Affordable housing? NO
	Are premiums getting what we want - no
	No more student housing - 6 BR. 1 and 2 bedroom would encourage or maybe 3 BR but not more
	413 doubled the premium - open space on ground level desired not on 3rd like 413
	Incentivize open green space
	Premiums for pedestrian walkway - wide sidewalk, shade, benches
	Give premium to developments that protect historic districts or outside historic
	Historic district - give more voice (power) to limit negative impact to Historic District put in zoning
	All agree they don't work
	No premiums for housing - premiums are opportunities for developers, markets are more influential on types of projects
	Should premiums be negotiations?
	Designate use, we don't need premiums
	Premiums don't make sense
	End results are unpredictable
	We don't have any solar - premiums just require it.
	In order to get premiums developers should conform to design guidelines
	Do we have right premiums - no more premiums for housing of any kind - we want to support smaller units

Downtown Zoning Evaluation: Community Meeting Feedback Date: August 5th, 2013 Location: 200 N. Main, Lower Level	
Other	Comments
Guidelines need more teeth	Guidelines have no teeth - need to be enforced
	Enforcement of design guidelines
	Design guidelines should have teeth (should be part of zoning)
	Massing and height should be mandatory in design guidelines
	Design guidelines should be enforceable by codes or zoning
	Design guidelines mandatory - more teeth
Reevaluate D1 areas - including South University	SU area shouldn't be D1 to Washtenaw - setbacks on Washtenaw, too tall, should be D2
	There should be D2 zoning buffering all residential areas (South U & other areas).
	D1 on South U. (not historic) older homes but declared D1
	Reevaluate all D1 areas - should they be D1 or less? - Thayer and N. Univ. should not be D1
	Rethink all D1 so not to revisit
	D1 corner of Thayer and N. University - should not be other places also not D1
	South U: D2? - no matter who owns it
Enforceable overlays	Principles in overlay written onto zoning
	Overlays - express what we want in terms of setbacks and massing
	Character overlay was not enforceable - not in zoning and should be
Green space	Encourage green space downtown (e.g. for kids)
	AA needs a very large park in downtown
	A city park on the same block as the Federal bldg. or other large open space

Other

Other	Comments
HDC should be involved with reevaluation process	Historic district commission should be involved in this reevaluation process
	Historic districts should be involved
	More power to HDC over neighboring areas - not zoned hist. dist.
Redefine D1 / D2	D1 height limit is too high
	Definitions of D1 and D2 can be revised to create stricter limits of height and bulk.
Suggestion of "D3 zone"	Zonings have no flexibility - if you only have D1 and D2
	Why not D3 with less than 10 stories
Buffer along Huron needs separation - pedestrian safety needs protection	
Require 10' setback	
Keep amenities of downtown in guidelines now	
There should NOT be more D1 zoning!	
Housing price/supply. Housing supply → price impacts (discussion whether higher supply drives)	
Area near Hill auditorium to be protected	
Abolish DDA	
Have form based codes	