

From: Andrew Strowe
Sent: Tuesday, August 22, 2017 3:58 PM
To: Barrett, Jon <JBarrett@a2gov.org>
Subject: Zoning variance request at 1140 Broadway

Mr. Barrett, could you include this letter to the ZBA for its meeting on the 23 August?

Thank you.

To the members of the Zoning Board of Appeals:

I hope that these comments about the 1140 Broadway request for a zoning variance (ZBA-17-025) do not come too late. The card sent to some of the neighbors indicated that letters were needed only if you did not intend to attend the public hearing on 23 August.

I believe that you should reject the request for the zoning variance. The developer argues that less than the required number of spaces per unit is justified by the presence of various forms of transportation and the hoped-for nearness of employment for most of the future tenants. However, parking does not concern the possible use of transportation modalities but rather the storage of vehicles that are not in use. The requirement of one space per unit is already not sufficient for such a large development. To drop below the requirement is inappropriate. It is more than likely that the two bedroom units will have several adults, related or unrelated, who might each

have a vehicle that needs to be parked. Charging tenants for their parking space, as the developer intends to do, will not dissuade tenants from having vehicles.

There is already a parking problem on Broadway and the surrounding neighborhoods. On Broadway, every weekday, starting at around 7AM employees from the hospital line the street from the start of the 1200 block through the 1500 block. The tenants in the proposed development who do not want to rent a parking space in the enclosed parking structure would most likely use the available street parking. Even with resident permits -- that excluded the 1140 Broadway tenants -- the situation would not be improved. First, there would be the early morning people from the hospital who would not find parking anymore. Second, the tenants of 1140 Broadway without parking spaces in the parking structure, would fill up the Broadway street parking, even if during the day their vehicles were in use, they would be stored on street during the evening and night and on the weekends. Resident permits will not alleviate the problem.

I believe there are a number of unanswered questions that should be addressed concerning the parking structure. Would a unit be allowed to rent two or more parking spaces? Would non-tenants be allowed to rent parking spaces? What would happen if all the parking spaces are rented and a tenant without a space needed one?

A larger issue, which I understand you cannot consider directly, is that the parking requirement goes back to a time when developments in residential areas of Ann Arbor were much smaller. If there were 10 or 20 units and not enough parking provided, then perhaps a few vehicles would have to find parking and storage on the city streets. But with a development involving 814 bedrooms, there is a potential for an enormous number of vehicles that will have to be stored or parked on the city streets.

As I read "5.99 - Application of the variance power" that governs the Zoning Board of Appeals, the developer does not meet a single one of the requirements (1)(a)-(e), let alone all of them as the preamble to (a)-(e) states it must. How the developer can argue that these affirmative findings do not apply to him is beyond comprehension. 5.99 (1)-(4) does not admit of a justification that ignores the requirements.

It is clear from the two public hearings before the Planning Commission that there is widespread concern about and opposition to this development in the surrounding neighborhoods to this development. The impact of the huge, densely clustered buildings on a 6.4 acre site is already overwhelming. To grant this variance would spread the effect of the development far off-site to the detriment of the neighborhoods around it and to the people who live there. I hope that you will consider the letters sent to the Planning Commission through the Planning Department by the neighbors

and not just those solicited by the developer and including in the request for a zoning variance. It seems inappropriate to include letters about a site plan in requesting a zoning variance concerning parking, but apparently the developer thinks otherwise.

I thank you for reading my comments and hope that you take them into consideration and deny the zoning variance. Your denial will not stop the project, but will lessen its adverse effects considerably. 620 living units (814 bedrooms) should have at least 620 parking spaces dedicated exclusively to the tenants.

Sincerely yours,

Andrew Strowe

1327 Broadway

Ann Arbor, MI