

From: Brian G <graham30@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, June 18, 2022 6:36 PM

To: Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>; DiLeo, Alexis <ADiLeo@a2gov.org>; Lenart, Brett <BLenart@a2gov.org>

Subject: TC1 Rezoning - Stadium Boulevard Area

Hi there,

I live on the west side of Ann Arbor (near Maple Rd) and have been closely following the progression of the TC1 rezoning effort. Unfortunately I was unable to attend the in-person public meeting at Westgate Library and the subsequent virtual presentation (although I did watch the recorded Webinar at a later time). I just wanted to **express my excitement and support** toward this rezoning effort. I feel the study area limits are very appropriate - - I wish it would include the Maple/Miller intersection as well, but understand the disjointed nature of adding those select few parcels could/would derail the progress of this effort. I feel the Stadium and Maple corridors have so much potential for infill development and establishing this area of town as a walkable/bikeable/bus-able place to live, shop, traverse, etc.

I am 100% supportive of the zero setbacks, 2-story height minimum, no minimum parking requirements, etc. However one thing that struck me is the max height allowances, which would allow "by-right" buildings to be 120 ft tall (or approx. 10-12 stories) in the majority of the district (with up to 300 ft or 25-30 stories tall for the one section near the SW corner of Maple Village). Sorry, but that just sounds ridiculous, excessive, and out of scale for this area. I understand that the market/lenders likely wouldn't allow for many of these very tall buildings to be built....but to transition from 1-story buildings in this area to 10-30 stories would be tough to stomach for many westside A2 residents (and likely a hard sell). I think 3-5 stories lining Stadium and Maple would feel much more appropriate and create that walkable, interesting, human-scaled "urban village" feel that is so desirable and coveted.

My only concern is...would revisiting height limits in this district completely sidetrack the progress of this effort (and set it back 1-2 years)? If the answer is "yes", then I would be happy if the Planning Commission just moved forward with the TC1 as is...and then hope for the best. I feel that it's just too imperative of an effort to delay any more.

Just my two sense. Thank you for your time and hard work - I am exciting to see this moving forward!!!

Best Regards,

Brian G.
Ward 5 resident