

Lenart, Brett

From: Moore, Beth <bmoore@med.umich.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, February 12, 2019 11:32 AM
To: CityCouncil; Planning
Subject: New 19 story building on Washington at State

Dear City Council and Planning Committee,

I am writing to express my concern over the proposed construction of yet another high-rise apartment building in downtown Ann Arbor. One of my biggest concerns is the sheer size of the structure that is proposed with 19 stories being significantly taller than other nearby buildings. Additionally, as a member of the First United Methodist Church that is on the corner of Huron and State, our church has been literally surrounded by new construction. If this building goes up on the south side of our church, we will essentially lose all sunlight into the area for most of the year, which will significantly impact our energy costs and will impact the memorial garden which is a final resting place for so many of our church members. It would be devastating to see this garden become barren. I also worry significantly about the planned addition of so much more housing, when there is already a very large number of new housing buildings that have gone up in recent years without any consideration for making downtown more livable. I would be much more in favor of seeing a downtown grocery store go into this location—hopefully one that would not be taller than nearby structures. Ann Arbor is a charming community but it is losing much of that charm with the new “tunnel feeling” that one gets as they drive down Huron. As the University of Michigan is not significantly expanding the student population, this seems ill-advised.

I hope the city council and planning commission will consider other options for this space.

Sincerely,
Beth Moore

Bethany B. Moore, PhD, ATSF
Galen B. Toews, M.D. Collegiate Professor of Internal Medicine, Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine
Professor of Microbiology and Immunology
Director, Graduate Program in Immunology
American Thoracic Society Fellow
4053 BSRB
109 Zina Pitcher Place
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-2200

Office phone: 734-647-8378
Lab phone: 734-647-9968
FAX: 734-615-2331
Email: bmoore@umich.edu
Lab Website: <https://sites.google.com/a/umich.edu/bethany-b-moore-lung-immunobiology-lab/home>
Immunology Program Website: <http://immunology.medicine.umich.edu/>

Electronic Mail is not secure, may not be read every day, and should not be used for urgent or sensitive issues

Lenart, Brett

From: Sarah Nooden <snooden@umich.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, February 13, 2019 11:58 PM
To: CityCouncil; Planning
Subject: 19 story bldg & FUMC

Today I was unable to attend either meeting concerning the impact of the 19 story building on the First United Methodist Church (FUMC) across the street from the site, but I wish to express my concerns. I have been an Ann Arbor area resident for 54 years, a church member for 32, worked and shopped in Ann Arbor for 54 years. I have seen the impact of the Maynard St skyscraper has had on Ann Arbor (a fiasco and precedent & shady deal by the Republicans who passed it on a quiet August meeting day when Democrats were away on vacation in the 1960's).

Here are my concerns:

Is there an actual need to have a building (no less at 19 stories) at this location?

Was any consideration given to a much lower height to allow sunshine on the FUMC (also the Baptist church will be impacted)?

Was an environmental impact study made?

Was any consideration given to having a smaller footprint allowing setback for ecosystem services – to allow for mature tree canopies which, for free, cleans the air, and provides a more healthful ambiance.

Was any consideration given to the impact on the FUMC, a wonderful church that serves not only a wide Ann Arbor community, but also state, nationally and internationally ?

Was any consideration given to the fact the Baptist and Methodist churches will be totally surrounded by tall buildings and be mostly shaded year around?

Was any consideration given to how this building will negatively affect the local climate and quality of life?

- Washington (& State) Street has become very congested with cars and pedestrians, this will impact air quality and safety.

- The building will cast a huge shadow on the FUMC for most of the day year around. It will impact the heating, cooling and lighting of the church, impact parking, shade our Memorial Garden and the Street trees which need the light to survive. Also it will impact the spiritual aspect of the church as all the south facing rooms will be in the shadow.
- The church is about “light” and how can one spread the message of that light when rooms that now are full of sunshine that lift people's spirits will always be in shadow. Jesus, the great healer, whose healing brings people into the light. How can one “heal” without that noon day light. We don't want to be a dark church.
- I urge the city and the developer to reconsider the consequences of having a building such as this in this already extremely congested area and whether it is really “green” to go so high and consequent impact on the community.

Sarah Nooden

FUMC member since 1987

From: Brian Smith <bmsmith8014@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, January 23, 2019 12:47 PM

To: Cheng, Christopher <CCheng@a2gov.org>; Lenart, Brett <BLenart@a2gov.org>

Cc: Angie Smith <smitha8014@yahoo.com>; Peter Avram <pavram82@gmail.com>; Megan Avram <megan.avram@gmail.com>; Juliet Pressel <jeppressel@comcast.net>; Gloria Jones <gloria.kathleen.jones@gmail.com>; Rosemary Bogdan <rosemarybogdan@gmail.com>

Subject: Fw: Mtg with Brightdawn Developer and Midwestern Consulting

Dear Chris & Bret,

I wanted to send you a quick note to let you know that a group of neighbors from Forestbrooke met with the developer of proposed Brightdawn Village project last night, as well as their consultant, Midwestern Consulting. The meeting was not productive, in fact I think it is fair to say we were all frustrated by the tone and outcome. The developer (the Schwartz family) did not even give us the courtesy of showing up to the meeting in person, instead deciding to phone in.

We were eager to engage in dialogue and discussion around solutions to the issues the neighbors raised in the PC meeting. Instead, the members of the developer's family who phoned in hostilely argued with us saying "you just don't understand" when we tried to explain our concerns over the density of the project. They charged neighbors to explain why we won't support rezoning for additional density at the site, instead of coming in with solutions to the concerns they heard us all voice at the December Planning Commission meeting, and accused us of being against "those people" when we were questioning the affordable housing aspects of the project. We are not sure exactly what they meant by the phrase, but they made inference that the 40 additional units they are bargaining for are to be earmarked for affordable or workforce housing, and therefore (because we were not supporting the additional density) we are 'against' lower wage earners. This is the furthest from the truth if you know the history of the site. The developer has used both "affordable housing" or "workforce housing" but looking at the economics (as we pointed out at the last PC mtg and Chairman Milshteyn acknowledged) they will really be charging what is more akin to market rate or above for all of these units as compared to other apartments and rental homes available in the area.

As you may remember, this site was originally zoned R1C (single family) but was changed to R4B approx 10 yrs ago when the initial developer (Simpson Housing) was looking to build an affordable housing project on the site. And we welcomed the development. The neighbors feel we and the city have already made a significant concession to consent to the zoning change of 10 years ago. Frankly many neighbors are interested in potential development on Burton Road via new ownership (as we have had many problems with trash dumping, etc on the site) but do not feel rezoning to a higher density allowance is in the best interest of the city or the community. It is important to note as you did at the last PC mtg, part of the City Master Plan **currently** envisions this property to be single family housing. It is striking to me that you have recommended that Planning Commission **deny** the rezoning request and they are not following your recommendations.

As clearly communicated to the developer, we are significantly concerned with the proposed additional density for a variety of reasons, primary of which is its unreasonable impact on pedestrian & traffic safety (with hundreds of new cars cutting through Forestbrooke to avoid traffic on Packard/Carpenter/Washtenaw Ave, as well as the impact on neighborhood schools and the larger Ann Arbor community. We noted to the developer last night, that even though their current plan does not call for the opening of Eli / Burton Road, several city services have called for this (which we **strongly** oppose and City Council supported us on 10 years ago) but regardless the developer has not (at all) studied the potential traffic impact **in the Forestbrooke neighborhood** from this development when we all know drivers are not going to turn left on Packard and left on Carpenter to get to Washtenaw/US23 but instead they are going to turn right on Packard and Right on Brandywine and cut through the the neighborhood. Brandywine has already become a cut through for those trying to avoid the Carpenter/Washtenaw intersection as well as the neighborhoods to the South of Packard. In particular, we are concerned that the area school, streets, parks and natural environment will be over burdened, and that the location -- so close to the highway and so inaccessible to main roadways, is unfit for such a large project to be developed.

Tom Covert, from Midwestern, said he would be sending in responses to the questions PC asked at the last mtg and I assume they will seek to get this on the Planning Commission agenda for Feb 5 (they all but said so). I wanted to make sure that you accurately heard our (the neighbor's) impression of the meeting from last night.

Thank you

All the best, Brian Smith, 2803 Lillian Rd.

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Brian Smith <bmsmith8014@yahoo.com>

To: Brian Smith' via Forestbrooke Brightdawn Development <forestbrooke-brightdawn-development@googlegroups.com>

Cc:

Sent: Wednesday, January 23, 2019, 9:36:59 AM EST

Subject: Mtg with Brightdawn Developer and Midwestern Consulting

Good morning all. I wanted to briefly update you on our meeting last night with the developer of the Brightdawn Project (the Schwartz family) and their consultant (Midwestern Consulting). The meeting was attended by the following neighbors: Peter Avram, Juliet & Jim Pressel, Rosemary Bogdan, Gloria Jones and myself. The meeting was "interesting" to say the least. The developer was combative and just could not understand why the neighborhood would not support the project as proposed. We, as a neighborhood group, were unified that our single biggest concern for the project as proposed, and the requested rezoning, was the density of the project and its many ancillary effects on the existing neighborhood. When the developer finally realized he was not going to bully us into agreeing with him, he took a rather condescending position and the meeting was effectively over from there. I want to thank all of the neighbors who came last night, as they spoke eloquently on our issues!

We were clear (crystal I would say) with both the developer and the Consultant that in no uncertain terms our single biggest issue is density (and its ancillary effects on a lot of other issues). As we all know there are really two key issues for us: density and opening of Burton Road to Eli. However, the discussion of opening Burton is not relevant (IMHO) with the developer as it gives him an item to trade to get his density (e.g., I will try to keep Burton closed if you agree to the density). He tried to bring it up, and we didn't fall for it. And frankly, the argument over Burton is not even really with the Planning Commission. The PC (and City Departments providing input into the Project Plan) are bent on opening Burton (as they were the last time) so our best chance of keeping it closed is with City Council (as they [City Council] has previously committed to keeping it closed in an open mtg).

Therefore, I think our best strategy at the next PC mtg is to remain united on fighting against the proposed density increase. We should think about how to best approach that at the next PC mtg. **The one piece of useful information I got from last night's meeting is the developer is trying to get on the February 5 Planning Commission agenda. We need to be ready for that and come out in force (as we did last time and more).**

We also learned last night (although I think we knew this) whether the PC approved the rezoning request or denies it, the issue will ultimately still go to City Council for decision (PC doesn't make this decision). The only way it does not go to City Council is if PC further tables the conversation (likely to pressure the developer to further engage with the neighbors to try to come up with some compromise).

Below are Gloria's notes of the meeting (thank you Gloria for doing that!). We should discuss how we speak on density at the next PC mtg.

We must keep up the good work we are all doing to make this project fit within the character of our little neighborhood so we can welcome it in as a new part of Forestbrooke without having to give up all we love about our hood or risking the safety of those in it.

Best, Brian

[Jan 22, 2019 Meeting with Brightdawn Developers and Neighborhood Representatives](#)

Lenart, Brett

From: Eric Hardin <eric@todayclothing.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 17, 2019 4:14 PM
To: Planning
Subject: 202 Miller

Dear Ann Arbor Planning,

I am writing you in support of the new proposed business at 202 Miller by Scientific Method Holdings , LLC, owned by Drew Hutton. As the owner of Today Clothing, 215 S. 4th Ave, and a resident of 410 N. 1st street, I welcome new thoughtful business in the neighborhood with a focus on quality and customer experience. I have gotten to know Drew over the past few years through his patronage of my store and have had many discussions with him regarding the vision for his business.

Best Regards,

Eric Hardin

Today Clothing
215 S. 4th Ave
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

todayclothing.com
734-548-8301

Lenart, Brett

From: Andrew Loy <aloy@loyhartley.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 10:12 AM
To: Planning
Subject: 202 Miller Avenue Provisioning Center

Ann Arbor City Planning Commission,

I wanted to thank you in advance of approving 202 Miller Avenue Special Exception Use for a Provisioning Center. I've known both Drew Hutton and the building owner professionally for a long period of time and respect their thorough and progressive business practices. Being a long-time Kerrytown resident, I welcome their business to the neighborhood. I greatly appreciate how they have already significantly improved their site at 202 Miller Ave and their future plans of continuing to improve the land and building in conjunction with the City's stated conditions. Inviting another responsible and engaged business owner to our downtown community will simply add to our already thriving environment.

Best regards,

Andrew E. Loy, CPA

Loy, Hartley & Company, 2211 Jackson Ave, Ann Arbor, MI 48103

[Direct [734-769-0098](tel:734-769-0098)] [Main [734-769-0075](tel:734-769-0075)] [Fax [734-769-1422](tel:734-769-1422)]

www.loyhartley.com

[Private Client Portal](#)

Lenart, Brett

From: Megan Avram <megan.avram@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 10:23 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Re: Proposed rezoning of 2805 Burton Road (Parcel #09-12-02-409-026)

Dear Ann Arbor Planning Commission,

Unfortunately, I won't be able to make it to the meeting tomorrow evening due to a sick baby, but I'd like to restate my opposition to the rezoning of this parcel for all of the reasons in my original email (below). The proposed development is simply too dense for this parcel of land, and the rezoning request should be denied.

I'd also like to follow up on a point I raised during the first meeting in December regarding the highway noise. Some commissioners mentioned that there are other apartment complexes built close to the highway, but this particular stretch of highway is far noisier than most stretches of highway due to several factors: its extremely close proximity to the busy Washtenaw on and off ramps, to the overpass over Packard Rd, and to the 94 exchange. Traffic is often backed up on this stretch of highway, and every day from inside my house, I can hear jake breaks, trucks downshifting, and cars hitting the rumble strips. No amount of white noise can mask these low frequency sounds, and I can't imagine how loud it would be for residents in 3rd or 4th floor apartments on eye level with the highway and in direct line of sight with the Packard Rd overpass. The proposed layout of this development would also create noise corridors that would funnel highway noise directly into houses on Lillian and Terhune.

In response to the questioning about noise abatement, the developer's representative mentioned some vague things they "could" do to reduce noise for the Brightdawn residents, but their plans do not actually include them. This means the developers are under no obligation to actually follow through with this type of noise abatement, and since they've stated their plans to eventually sell the apartments, they have no long-term incentive to create quality housing that integrates with the existing neighborhoods.

I know Ann Arbor is short on affordable housing, and I am in favor of building affordable housing that will actually meet the needs of its residents and the broader community. However, this development isn't actually promising truly affordable housing anyway--as one commissioner pointed out, it's more market rate, given the parcel's proximity to the highway.

Thank you,
Megan Avram
3630 Terhune Rd

On Mon, Dec 17, 2018 at 8:58 PM Lenart, Brett <BLenart@a2gov.org> wrote:

Thank you for your comments, they will be shared with the Planning Commission.

Sincerely,

Brett Lenart, AICP - Planning Manager

City of Ann Arbor Planning & Development Services

Direct (734) 794-6000 #42606 | General (734) 794-6265

From: Megan Avram <megan.avram@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, December 17, 2018 8:37 PM

To: Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>

Subject: Proposed rezoning of 2805 Burton Road (Parcel #09-12-02-409-026)

Dear Ann Arbor Planning Commission,

I'm writing regarding the proposed "Brightdawn" development at 2805 Burton Road (parcel #09-12-02-409-026). The developers are requesting to rezone it from R4B to R4C. As a concerned citizen of Ann Arbor, a homeowner in the neighboring Forestbrooke community, and a parent of current and future Pittsfield Elementary students, I want to voice my **strong opposition** to this proposal and state my many concerns.

1. Current zoning is already multiple family dwelling, and **this parcel was already rezoned from single family homes in 2007:**

- a. The parcel is currently zoned as R4B, which allows 120 units for the size. The rezoning request to 160 units is a **150%** increase in density over the original zoning of R1C--which only allowed a maximum of 48 dwelling units--and an increase of **33%** over the existing zoning.
- b. The neighboring community only agreed to withdraw their opposition to the previous rezoning from R1C to R4B because the previous owners were going to develop the whole property as affordable housing. That development was to have **80 units at 60% AMI**.
- c. The Brightdawn development is only willing to do 40 of the requested 160 units at 80% AMI. This goes against Ann Arbor's commitment to *truly* affordable housing.

2. Proposed zoning doesn't match the neighboring community:

- . There is no R4D zoning within 3 miles of the parcel, and there appear to be only 5 uses in all of Ann Arbor.
 - a. All of the neighboring land use is either single- or two-family houses (R1C or R2A).
 - b. The 50 ft building height limit is significantly higher than all nearby buildings. These 4-story buildings will loom over the adjacent single family homes.
 - c. R4D zoning for this parcel is against the City's Master Plan.

3. Destruction of wetlands:

. By increasing housing density and land use, there will be a higher likelihood of flooding for the homes on the east side of Lillian Rd that abut Burton Rd.

a. Many of the residents on Lillian Rd and Eli Rd noted increased flooding after past development activity affected drainage of the neighboring wetlands.

4. Increased traffic:

. The traffic study conducted by the developers is inadequate. It only analyzed main roads like Packard and didn't study the impacts to the residential streets like Brandywine and Yost Blvd (the paths most traffic going to Washtenaw or US-23 would take).

a. Additional traffic on Yost Blvd would endanger children on their way to school or during summer activities (like swim practice at Forestbrooke Pool) due to the lack of sidewalks on Yost over the creek.

b. Connecting Eli Rd to Burton Rd would only further exacerbate the pedestrian safety issue because there is no sidewalk adjacent to the Forestbrooke pool at the corner of Eli and Yost. The rain gardens installed in 2018 at the pool (to protect the creek) would be destroyed if a sidewalk were constructed.

c. Additional traffic would speed the deterioration of the already poorly rated roads within the Forestbrooke subdivision.

d. The number of proposed parking spots is inadequate for the number of allowed tenants. Because the development is bordered by US-23 and Packard Road, the spillover cars could only park on neighboring streets closest to the proposed development, and this would further increase congestion, decrease pedestrian safety, and complicate snow removal and other street maintenance.

5. Increased noise:

. Artificial noise corridors would be created by the removal of natural features (e.g., trees, bushes, etc.) to build additional buildings to accommodate the increase in density. This would funnel the already loud vehicle noise from US-23 directly to the existing homes. Residents already have to use white noise machines at night to attempt to mask the highway noise. (I doubt there would be noise machines loud enough to mask the noise inside the proposed apartments.)

a. Limited parking and exponential use of Burton Road would dramatically increase vehicle-based noise pollution for the residents on Lillian, Eli, and Terhune.

Finally, I have serious concerns about the ability of these particular out-of-state developers to construct an apartment complex that will integrate with the existing neighborhood and enhance Ann Arbor as a whole. They've publicly stated their intention to sell the development within 10 years, so they're not invested longterm in our community. Additionally, the developers initially submitted plans to the city for a 160-unit development, even though a quick Google search by a layperson (like me) shows that R4B only allows 120 units for this parcel. The developers overlooked a fundamental detail like that and are now scrambling to make the parcel fit their needs, rather than modifying their plans to fit the parcel itself. Our neighborhood shouldn't have to suffer so that an inexperienced developer can profit, and we urge you to deny the rezoning request.

Thank you for your careful consideration,

Megan Avram
3630 Terhune Rd
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Lenart, Brett

From: AMY BRIDGES <amyzta118@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 12:14 PM
To: Planning
Subject: New building at State and Washington

Hello,

I'm excited about the prospect of new development at the corner of State and Washington! As an active member of the church across the street, I welcome the new residents and businesses that will make this a vibrant part of the city.

I hope that the plan for this structure will take into account:

1. Physical aesthetic to the surrounding buildings - particularly the two churches across the street. These historic structures are a beautiful architectural contrast to many of the stark hi-rises we see. I hope the new building's architecture relates to the churches to the north and the theater to the south.
2. Pedestrian safety - since the churches and resident hall don't have much parking, there is a LOT of pedestrian traffic. I hope that the new structure will leave ample sidewalk and green space to protect pedestrians, especially our church members and visitors who are multi-generational.
3. Impact of the new building on the neighborhood's ability to interact with nature. Sunlight and a good breeze are important to the HVAC systems of the nearby structures- particularly those older buildings. The church is not fully air conditioned, and relies on breeze on hot days!
4. Impact on the worship experience. I hope the planners will attend a worship service at 9:30 am to see how the sunlight through the south windows is part of worship. A new tall building will impact this, but building materials and design don't have to eliminate the sunlight we currently enjoy through our beautiful stained glass windows. Those windows were designed to interact with light!

Thanks for helping our city and neighborhood move into the next phase.

Amy Bridges

Lenart, Brett

From: Carole Metzger <carolekm@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 12:27 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Brightdawn Development

Dear Planning Commission,

As a Forestbrooke resident I have significant concerns about the Brightdawn Development. I am unable to attend the Planning Commission meeting this evening but would like to articulate my concerns here.

My concerns are regarding the density of the proposed development and the impact on the traffic and noise for the surrounding community. I don't oppose developing that parcel of land, however, determining the optimal density must be taken into consideration.

Could you please

1. Conduct a traffic study on the area.
2. Conduct a noise study on the area.

Thank you for taking these comments into your consideration.

Sincerely,

Carole Metzger

(734) 239-5583