

Subject: TC-1 support; please do NOT downzone C3/R3 conflict area!

From: Kirk Westphal

Sent: Monday, June 3, 2024 6:56 PM

To: Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>

Cc: Lenart, Brett <BLenart@a2gov.org>; Kelley, Hank <HKelley@a2gov.org>

Subject: TC-1 support; please do NOT downzone C3/R3 conflict area!

Dear Commission:

Please approve the TC-1 rezonings! It's exciting to be wrapping up this phase of TC-1 after many years.

Please do not downzone the **northern notch** of the Pittsfield Village parcels and instead simply leave the conflict area zoned C3 and remove the townhouse zoning from the area where it overlaps with C3 — even though it doesn't follow the current parcel boundary.

I agree with the need to decide *which* zoning designation to use where these two zones are in conflict.

I also appreciate the desire to "clean up" the map by making the zoning district follow the parcel boundary, however in this case it appears this would be very harmful to the redevelopment potential of an entire strip mall on a key block on Washtenaw due to TC-1 buffering requirements. I may be misreading the UDC, but to my interpretation of the map and buffering requirements of TC-1, choosing R3 as the "winning" zoning category for this C3/R3 conflict area (containing Pittsfield Village office, maintenance yard, and the northern edge of mostly very deep townhouse backyards) will cause R3 to go abruptly northward and therefore:

- will apparently eliminate the full redevelopment potential of the soon-to-be TC-1 corner lot facing Washtenaw (Falsetta's Market) because *TC-1 requires an 80' buffer from R zones, which looks to be the depth of the existing building (which also appears to suffer from a strange parcel boundary artifact on its northern boundary that further restricts its depth)*
- assuming the Washtenaw property owners would like to redevelop much of this area in its entirety, will complicate redeveloping the entire block, requiring a change in height toward the corner due to the fact that TC-1 buildings require both a 30' setback and an 80' buffer from "R" districts for any part of a building above 55'. (Drawing is a very rough approximation.)



While I'm guessing the good folks on the Pittsfield Village management team don't want a taller building potentially next to their office and maintenance lot, the adverse impact on development here is significant if you downzone.

The townhouse occupants to the west will still benefit from a 30' setback and height tapering from the northern edge of the R3 boundary. (Plus any future TC-1 buildings will be to the north, so there is no shadow implication at any time of year. Drawing is a rough approximation.)



We should not be erring on the side of downzoning.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kirk Westphal
Ward 2