

—Original Message—

From: Cathleen Connell [<mailto:cathleen@umich.edu>]

Sent: Wednesday, December 07, 2011 10:58 AM

To: Planning

Subject: City Place

I've owned a single family home at 445 South Fourth Avenue for over 20 years. I am in complete support of the appeal filed by my neighbors regarding the exemption of City Place from the city's landscape ordinance.

Please protect neighboring properties from any and all further harm as provided for in the zoning ordinance. Fifth Avenue has been and always will be on my walking commute route.

The loss of a buffer to what will soon be City Place is definitely a public harm.

Cathleen M Connell, Ph.D.

Professor, Department of Health Behavior & Health Education University of Michigan School of Public Health (2834) Associate Director, Center for Managing Chronic Disease 734-647-3189;

cathleen@umich.edu

From: Peter Deininger [<mailto:peterdeininger@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, December 07, 2011 10:15 AM
To: Planning
Subject: City Place

Dear ZBA:

My name is Peter Deininger, and I co-own and manage 432 Hamilton Place and 318 East Jefferson (both owned as Cappo Management, LLC) which is directly abutting and within 100 feet next to and across the street from the City Place. I express my support for the appeal brought by Tom Whitaker, et al, regarding the exemption of City Place from the City's landscape ordinance, as well as other decisions made by the City in regard to this project. This project will have a major impact on this neighborhood and I fully expect the City to do the utmost to protect neighboring properties from any potential harms, as provided for in the zoning ordinance, and accordingly please make the necessary adjustments to the existing site plans.

Thank You,
Peter W. Deininger
Cappo Management, LLC
Deinco Properties, LLC
734-996-1991

From: robert@hightower.org [<mailto:rrhh@comcast.net>]

Sent: Wednesday, December 07, 2011 11:12 AM

To: Planning

Subject: Zoning Board of Appeals - Support of Appeal brought by Tom Whitaker regarding the exemption of City Place from the City's landscape Ordinance

ATTENTION: Zoning Board of Appeals

I, Robert Hightower, and my wife Catherine, own and manage three buildings at 416 South 5th Ave, 402-404 South 5th Ave, and 212 E. William. All three buildings are located within 100 feet across the street from the City Place site.

WE OPPOSE CITY COUNCIL'S WAIVING OF REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEVELOPER OF CITY PLACE TO PROVIDE LANDSCAPE SCREENING.

We are writing to express our support for the Zoning Appeal brought by Tom Whitaker, et al, regarding the exemption of City Place from the City's Landscape Ordinance, as well as other decisions made by the City in regard to this project.

Since this project will have a major impact on the neighborhood, we urge the City to minimize the potential negative harms resulting from this out-of-scale massive project by strictly enforcing the Zoning Ordinance regarding landscaping. We believe that eliminating the requirement for a landscape buffer would unquestionably have an overall detrimental effect on the neighborhood.

Robert and Catherine Hightower

robert@hightower.org

734-769-5764

220 E. William

Ann Arbor, MI 48104

—Original Message—

From: Nancy [<mailto:snowshore@comcast.net>]

Sent: Wednesday, December 07, 2011 1:03 PM

To: Planning

Subject: ZBA City Place

Zoning Board of Appeals

As a member of our community, I support requiring the City Place project to meet the letter of the law in order to minimize its negative impacts on the neighborhood, street, and setting of precedents.

Thank you for your consideration.

Nancy Kaplan

—Original Message—

From: Eleanor R Linn 1 [<mailto:elinn@umich.edu>]

Sent: Wednesday, December 07, 2011 10:57 AM

To: Planning

Subject: City Place Buffer Planting

Dear Planning/Zoning officials,

I am shocked that you would consider allowing the City Place development to do away with buffer plantings where its parking lot abuts small residential parcels. The requirement for planting is an important regulation in the city code, making it possible for small, historic buildings to be livable alongside larger developments.

This has been a highly contentious project, which the city has insisted it only approved of because it met all requirements of the ordinance. Why waive a useful requirement now?

Please vote NO on this appeal request. Those of us who live in and near downtown deserve better protection from you.

Sincerely,

Eleanor Linn

—Original Message—

From: Peter Nagourney [<mailto:pjn@mail.umich.edu>]

Sent: Wednesday, December 07, 2011 11:55 AM

To: Planning

Subject: City Place Project Buffer

Dear Zoning Board of Appeals,

I am writing to express my concern that the developer of City Place wishes to bypass the city's requirement for a landscape buffer (required in Chapter 62 of the zoning ordinance).

This would be an immediate mistake, and set an unfortunate precedent.

Please make sure this project abides by all zoning regulations, including the required landscape buffer.

Thank you,

Peter Nagourney
Co-Chair, North Burns Park Association
914 Lincoln Avenue
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

From: Ellen Ramsburgh [<mailto:ejramsburgh@hotmail.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, December 07, 2011 11:07 AM

To: Planning

Subject: appeal to ZBA

I am writing to express my support of the appeal of the City Council's decision to waive the requirement of a landscape buffer between the City Place project and the neighboring properties. I urge the ZBA to require a buffer to protect adjoining properties from the full negative impact of this out-of-scale infill development.

Ellen Ramsburgh

1503 Cambridge Road

From: Deanna Relyea [<mailto:relyead@gmail.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, December 07, 2011 12:32 PM
To: Planning
Subject: City Place appeal

Dear ZBA board members and staff,

I write to add my voice to the concerns expressed in the current appeal from Germantown neighbors.

In a word----I quote city staff re City Place proposal 2009

"The proposed site plan is inconsistent with the recommendations of the Central Area Plan regarding neighborhood preservation, infill development, out of scale construction, and historic preservation....The typical residential building in the neighborhood is approximately 2,000 square feet in size with footprints that generally vary from between 1,000 square feet and 1,200 square feet. The size of each of the two proposed buildings is approximately 30,000 square feet with a footprint of approximately 10,000 square feet." --City Planning Staff, 4/16/09

I live one block from this proposed project. We are hoping that the city has some vision left for this lovely area of near downtown and will consider this appeal which could make a huge difference in the ambiance of our neighborhood.

I am in Europe and have not had regular email access----hoping that my voice can be heard.

*Deanna Relyea
451 South Fourth Ave*

Kerrytown Concert House
Deanna Relyea, Executive Director
734/769-2999

From: Donald Salberg [<mailto:donsalberg@comcast.net>]
Sent: Wednesday, December 07, 2011 11:09 AM
To: Planning
Subject: Support for the Appeal Related to Common Place Project

Dear Sir or Ms:

I offer my support for the appeal submitted by citizens living next to the City Place project which challenges City Place developer's decision NOT to provide landscape screening between their huge new building and the properties located to the south. Hopefully, the Zoning Board of Appeal will insist that the City Place developer include buffering between the new construction and proximate buildings.

Thank you,

Donald Salberg
Ann Arbor, Michigan

—Original Message—

From: C. Robert Snyder [<mailto:chazsnyd@gmail.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, December 07, 2011 12:13 PM

To: Planning

Cc: Tom Whitaker; Ray Detter; Eppie Potts; Chris Crockett; Peter Nagourney; Ilene R. Tyler; Norman Tyler; Hugh Sonk; Christine Brummer

Subject: City Place Zoning

Members of the Ann Arbor Zoning Board of Appeals,

We respectfully ask that you, the members of the Planning Commission/ZBA, deny any further easing or suspending of the current zoning ordinances in respect to the City Place development. While you can't undo the desecration that has already taken place with the destruction of the seven historic homes on Fifth Ave., nor make City Place less ugly and out of character with the neighborhood, you do have the power to at least stop the egregious suspending of current zoning laws re: landscaping and buffering.

Don't follow the example of City Council! Do the right thing this one last time!

Members of the South University Neighborhood Association C. Robert Snyder, President

From: Shirley Zempel [<mailto:zempel.shirley@gmail.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, December 07, 2011 11:56 AM
To: Planning
Subject: City Place

It is my understanding that the City of Ann Arbor Planning Commission agrees to the request of the the developer of City Place to build two huge buildings, with a dense population, not nearly enough parking spaces, and not nearly enough landscape screening to mask this industrial style construction. I have been disappointed with the direction the city has taken in guiding the construction on this property as the development will not only be unsightly in this neighborhood but the increase in population and lack of parking spaces affects the whole neighborhood. I would hope you will consider the effect this will have in the surrounding area and perhaps consider parking restrictions such as they have on The Old West Side . This affects a much larger area that the blueprint of the building

Thank you.

Shirley Zempel
434 S. 4th Ave.

—Original Message—

From: Peter Zetlin [<mailto:pzetlin@gmail.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, December 07, 2011 10:53 AM
To: Planning
Subject: City Place

Please be aware that there is community support for requiring City Place to meet the letter of the law in order to minimize its negative impacts. Council's waiving of any requirement for the developer to provide any landscape screening between City Place and the properties located to the south appears to violate the zoning law. I trust the Board will uphold the law.

Sincerely,
Peter Zetlin
Ann Arbor