

From: Evan Pratt <epratt135@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 5:02 PM
To: DiLeo, Alexis <ADiLeo@a2gov.org>
Subject: W Stadium/Maple rezoning

Dear Ms. Dileo

I recently had the opportunity to review the staff memo and other information related to the ongoing public process for potential rezoning in the W Stadium/Maple/Jackson Rd area.

I support the general idea for rezoning in this area and appreciate staff opening the public process with a fairly bold proposal to envision a transition to more intensive land use in areas near a major entrance to the City that is currently dominated by one-story buildings and large parking lot.

I very much agree with the sentiment of several of the comments and letter received about the various benefits of moving toward more housing density -- with separation/transition/buffering from existing single family (and less intensive multiples) residential neighborhoods.

I also concur with the folks who have noted the importance of the wide range of mostly local businesses in the study area. I am not fully up to speed on the requirements of the T1, C3, or potential T2 district but would hope there is a way to ensure at least similar square footage (and similar rental pricing structure) for those local businesses within the rezoning footprint, -- if not more square footage considering the potential added density.

One resident suggested in a letter that 4-5 story buildings would be appropriate and in character. I would generally agree with those heights, with two caveats: First that a transition zone from one or two story residential might be consistent with best practices here. Second that we consider greater height closer to parts of I-94 and other appropriate areas. I expand on that second point in the following paragraphs.

10-15 years ago, the CPC and ultimately Council 'upzoned' several areas at the interchange entrances to town - I believe Washtenaw/23 and a subset of this area, and possibly other areas such as S State. Unfortunately, as staff and current CPC all are no doubt aware and have discussed, the increase in FAR was not enough to incent much in the way of redevelopment.

From my sometimes inaccurate memory, I recall not long after that rezoning, a financial analysis was performed by an outside consultant to determine what type of density near the Washtenaw/23 corridor would be needed to support a parking garage. Of course vertical parking would provide additional footprint for FAR as well as any additional parking that might be identified due to increased density, etc. I'm sorry I do not recall which consultant, but I do recall that the tipping point was at 6-story buildings/600% FAR. I don't recall for sure but believe 400% was what was provided. To be clear, I don't recall if that 'tipping point' was overtly noted in the analysis, I believe the consultant was someone I knew and quizzed afterwards. I also am not totally sure if the consultant was hired directly by the City or was more a part of the Re-Imagine Washtenaw effort.

Regardless, my memory doesn't really matter, the point is that was the biggest disappointment from the prior rezoning -- it didn't incent investment. Many of the subject buildings are past their (limited)

service life (these are not the more durable brick buildings of downtown AA) but are still the main source of revenue for each property owner.

Many property owners would be out upwards of 2 years of revenue during a redevelopment process, likely an obstacle for many. I have not reviewed the information enough to know for sure if there has been any analysis or outreach to potentially affected property owners but hopefully there has been something along those lines.

So in that context I would also support smaller, targeted sub-areas with greater FAR -- towards 600%-800% as long as there was reasonable transition from adjacent neighborhoods, streets/sidewalks, or other 'boundary conditions'. Such as taller by the freeway, maybe 4-5 stories at halfway points to Stadium (such as TJMaxx, etc) and whatever height is acceptable public consensus on the west side of W. Stadium and in 'transition zones' to areas that will not be re-zoned (e.g. maybe 3-story max next to residential) .

Finally, while I write as a resident, I am very interested in infrastructure so would echo comments by others that my support is in the context of at least maintaining current service levels for all infrastructure and hopefully some targeted improvements related to things such as pedestrian experience/amenities, or other improvements currently targeted in the CIP or otherwise of expressed community interest by folks living in the area.

It appears that Planning staff has heard most if not all that feedback and I am hopeful that there will be a substantial rezoning that will be a good fit for the primary goal of moving away from single story buildings and huge parking lots.

To sum up, my main points are:

- I support the rezoning concept as beneficial to many of our community's stated goals, including housing, sustainability and transit.
- I have highlighted what seemed to be the most important caveats that Planning has already compiled and stood out for me - especially making sure local businesses have plenty of opportunity
- It will be critically important to have enough incentive for property owner/developer investment.

Evan Pratt
1st ward resident

who has bought from many of the area businesses for three decades, something every week. Taco King, Chela's, Pilar's O'Reilly's, Gorton Food Svc, Convenience Auto, Bank of AA, Wolverine, Sweetwaters, Kroger, Plum Market Sect'y of State, resale store, Zingerman's, Westgate Library, Star Cafe, Seva's, Play it Again, Arbor Farms, Goldfish Swim School, to name a few regulars that came to mind as I wrote. Plus formerly K-Mart, Village Kitchen, Radio Shack, Sofia's, etc.

Fun fact: You can get drive through bacon at Zingerman's Roadhouse. 3-piece or 5.