

—Original Message—

From: Gerald Server [\[mailto:gserver@umich.edu\]](mailto:gserver@umich.edu)

Sent: Tuesday, January 11, 2011 8:45 AM

To: Planning

Subject: University Bank PUD

Commissioners,

I have attached an e-mail I sent to Mr. Ken Sprinkles of University Bank expressing my thoughts about the current parking lot plans.

Thank you,

Gerald Server

January 7, 2011

Dear Mr. Sprinkles,

In response to your e-mail of January 5, 2011, my wife and I had been waiting to meet with you, the University Bank officials, and the neighbors concerning the proposed parking lot and PUD changes. I hope that this meeting will still occur. As we have discussed with you we certainly have concerns about this proposal. My major concern is that the proposed additional parking not have any negative impact on either our property value or the aesthetic nature of our home.

The new revisions that have been proposed do remove fewer trees but still have draw backs. The plans for alternative 1 with the narrower access road appear to show a paved walk way on the East side of the drive that would require the removal of more trees. Does this walk way need to exist? The removal of any existing trees is of major concern. If trees are removed they need to be replaced with large trees that would provide a visual buffer comparable to the current existing condition.

Second, the proposed new fence, since it would be further into our yard based on the new survey, needs to be more substantial than a six foot wooden fence. Sound as well as visual abatement is required as traffic next to our yard would increase. Also the existing chain link fence in the back of our yard would require replacement to decrease noise and car and lot light from the parking area itself.

The second alternative of additional parking in front of the Bank appears to show access to this new area only from an entrance that would be directly opposite our driveway making getting in and out of our drive much more difficult and hazardous to us and to Bank traffic. Traffic exiting the new area would have to avoid both traffic from our drive and from the existing Bank parking. If this alternative is pursued access to this new space needs to be from the existing parking area preferably on the West side away from the current shared road. Also this proposal would make parking visible directly in front of our home and have a very negative impact on our property as it cannot be obscured by landscaping if the access road is opposite our drive.

My wife and I together with other concerned neighbors look forward to reviewing these new proposals with you so that we might offer our comments concerning them.

We bought our home based upon the assumption that no external changes would be made to the property or to the Bank. Building new parking and increasing the number of employees would change all of this and increase the traffic along the shared road necessitating an increase in the road maintenance costs that must be born solely by the Bank with a decrease in the percentage of the costs to us and to Dr. Yassir. If a new parking area is constructed there can be no further Bank parking along the north side of the current access road.

Finally there can be no impediment to access to our home by city services such as garbage and recycle collection during or following construction.

Respectfully,

Gerald Serwer, MD