

**Lenart, Brett**

---

**From:** spencer symington <spencer.symington@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 17, 2019 5:13 PM  
**To:** Planning  
**Cc:** CityCouncil

Hello,

I am writing in regards to the possible rezoning at the 2857 Packard Road property to accommodate 56 houses.

This causes much concern for me as I have been a resident of this neighborhood for 35 years. The infrastructure is not suitable for a development of this nature and I fear that this will ultimately become a financial burden on the community.

The plumbing in this neighborhood is a nightmare and the traffic is already out of control. Carmel should have speed bumps and Easy Street should have a light. Furthermore it is inevitable that a property will have to be annexed on Carmel or Easy Street to accommodate a sidewalk for children to easily access a walk to Allen Elementary School and Buhr Park.

Please consider the long term consequences of a residential development on the property.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best Regards,

Spencer Symington



**Lenart, Brett**

---

**From:** dsandjd@comcast.net  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 16, 2019 8:31 PM  
**To:** Lenart, Brett  
**Cc:** Jeannette Duane  
**Subject:** Please read my letter concerning development at 28 57 Packard Rd.

Dear Mr Lenart,

I sent this letter to the planning commission, and the city council and Mayor.. VIA email.

Is there anything else I should do to make sure it comes to their attention? I cannot attend the Planning Commission meeting on the 18th of June. I may be able to attend the Council meeting on the 24th.

June 16, 2019

Jeannette Duane

2744 Kimberley Rd.

Ann Arbor, MI 48104

To: Brett Lenart and Planning Department

Alex Milshteyn and Planning Commission

All City Council Representatives

Regarding : Rezoning consideration to PUD for 2857 Packard/ Peter's Building proposed development

Please be careful as you consider the next step in the approval process for this development. Set high expectations and requirements, not "requests" or "recommendations", in any negotiations with this plan and developer. Ask for more than what you hope to get with this. From reading the documents in the history of this process, I see many iterations of this developer ignoring "requests" or "recommendations". His inability or unwillingness to respect Natural Features preservation is one example. Take a hard negotiating position.

I just saw in recent documents that the likely asking price for these “units” is now \$350,000 to \$450,000. This is up from \$280,000 when first proposed. When you granted rezoning to R1E, one strong reason was so that this would not end up as a high-priced, “giant-house on medium-lot” development. You wanted the development to honor an important goal of the city’s Master Plan – housing that was priced within reach of a more diverse economic population. Now you are looking at a high-priced, “medium-house on tiny-lot” development with houses packed in like sardines. Is that what you are going to accept after all the work you have put into your city Master Plan, and development codes? The plan shows 2 car garages and room for 2 cars in the driveway as well – for 51 units on a 7-acre parcel. Do you think people will be taking the bus when they spend \$450,000 for their houses? This proposal fails at your goals.

The developer’s move for a PUD zoning sounds like an attempt to try to get what he wants, without giving what he needs to. Is there a walkway planned now through the middle housing section for the east side homeowners to access the larger open space, as was “requested” several times by the planning department? The presence of an historic dwelling (not “officially” designated so, but historic nonetheless) on the site has not been addressed though concerned neighbors and preservationists have pleaded for an opportunity to discuss a way to move and preserve the structure. Granted the dwelling is not being sold to the builder, but the city staff in charge could advocate for this and include it as part of a rezoning deal.

The traffic impact will be significant and problematic to our extended neighborhood. The developer did submit a study, and the city approved it. I believe that was a mistake. Requiring a slightly lower density of housing is one way you could lessen the traffic impact without having to solve the larger, city-wide traffic issue first. I know that the idea of higher density housing is, in some ways, a way to address the out-of-town commuting traffic. Yet, I doubt that at the \$450,000 price point, this development would be a place that many earners who now commute to Ann Arbor could afford to live. Are you really getting anything for our city’s Master Plan from this development? And I haven’t even delved into the depth of the “Natural Features Preservation”, disregard.

I am sorry I am unable to attend the meeting on June 18<sup>th</sup>. I know this letter is a bit heavy-handed, but this would be the tone of my Public Comments if I were able to make them in person.

Thank you for your attention and consideration of this matter. I do believe that you are well intentioned and that you care about the city. Please proceed carefully, consider your constituents, and act with authority.

cc:

Jeannette Duane

**Lenart, Brett**

---

**From:** Mark Clevey <mclevey123@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 06, 2019 9:39 PM  
**To:** Planning  
**Cc:** Stults, Missy; Eaton, Jack; Ackerman, Zach; Grand, Julie; Mirsky, John  
**Subject:** Solar Readiness

Brett:

It was a pleasure to hear your presentation and to talk with you at the Packard Development meeting tonight. The problem I found with the Packard Development is the same with others that I have reviewed: *lack of Solar Readiness*. Every structure that is not Solar Ready (i.e., solar compatible) will be shackled, for its entire life-cycle, to climate change causing fossil fuel generated electricity or, at a much higher cost, DTE owned renewable energy (most likely wind energy). *By definition, non-Solar Ready developments are not compatible with either Ann Arbor's Climate Action Plan or new Sustainability Plan and, as such, contribute to climate change risks.*

Within this context, I would recommend that the City Council, Planning Commission and Planning Department consider requiring the Packard Development developer, and any and all developers for and all future developments in the city, to ensure that *every structure in their proposed development be Solar Ready*:

1. All main roofs face south with sufficient roof space to accommodate enough solar panels to meet the expected building electrical needs;
2. Buildings are all electric (HVAC, Appliances, Electric Vehicle Charging, etc.);
3. Buildings are Battery Storage ready; and,
3. Any trees that need to be removed to accommodate the Solar Readiness be replaced on the east or west sides of buildings.

I thank you for your time and consideration. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions.

Respectfully,

Mark Clevey, Acting Chair  
Ann Arbor Energy Commission

**Mark H. Clevey, MPA**

- Specialist in Sustainability, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (40+ years)
- Veteran, US Air Force (1967-1972)
- Chairperson, City of Ann Arbor Energy Commission
- Vice President, Great Lakes Renewable Energy Association
- Co-Founder & Former Treasurer, Michigan Interfaith Power and Light

Re: 2857 Packard Road PUD Site Plan

June 6, 2019

Bryce Veldkamp  
2869 Easy St  
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Planning Services  
City of Ann Arbor  
301 E. Huron St  
Ann Arbor, MI 48107

Dear Ann Arbor City Planning Staff:

Please accept the following comments on the 2857 Packard Rd PUD Site Plan in lieu of my inability to attend the Tuesday, June 18, 2019 Public Hearing on the matter.

As a resident whose property directly borders the 2857 lot that is being requested for rezoning, I have been attending Resident Participation Meetings as well as a meeting with Planning Team members so as to be informed on the matter. To the best of my understanding, I would like to voice my support for the approval of this lot to be rezoned as a PUD site....HOWEVER, my support of this is contingent upon a strong desire (which I know I share with the overwhelming majority of my neighbors) that the Planning Staff would seek to recommend approval for this rezoning ONLY if all avenues are pursued to move toward a proposal that fits with the current density of all its surrounding neighborhoods. In short, I believe that a proposal more akin to 20 units instead of 51 total units is what should be sought after.

I have condensed into the following two reasons why I hold to and encourage all to be done that a proposal of 20 total units be pursued instead:

1. It would much better fit in the fabric of all the neighborhoods surrounding it which is what makes this area of the city so desirable and livable. With a much denser site plan, and some units said to be going for upwards of over \$400,000 (about double what many homes in its neighborhood cost), the current proposal as is tears at the core of what seems to be the last remnant in the city where affordable housing can be found. South Packard was the only section of the city I could even look in when purchasing a home a year ago. If Ann Arbor is serious about heeding the outcry for affordable housing in its bounds, 2857 Packard is the prime place to prove it.
2. If it dovetails with the fabric of its surrounding neighborhood, it would greatly benefit both those living in and also around the new development. It would do this by:
  - providing better site lines without houses being so close together,
  - allowing people to be neighbors without having to be right on top of each other,
  - quite likely allowing the preservation of more landmark trees and the current 1849 farmhouse which are important to so many,

- and not exacerbating as much the already congested South Packard area traffic.

I know some on City Council have voiced that a few McMansion-style homes were not desirable for the proposed lot, and I would agree. But the sensible middle ground of matching density has been completely jumped over such that now 51 units is being proposed. Therefore, I cannot help but imagine, and highly recommend to the Planning Commission, that it is still strongly possible and best for a proposal closer to 20 units to be recommended and pursued.

Thank You for Your Time,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Bryce E. Veldkamp". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Bryce E. Veldkamp  
Easy St Resident

**Lenart, Brett**

---

**From:** Jennifer Wolf <jwolf2000@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, June 07, 2019 6:34 PM  
**To:** Planning; CityCouncil  
**Cc:** Clevey, Mark (EC)  
**Subject:** Solar Readiness for 2857 Packard Road

Hi Brett,

Thank you for your time on Thursday evening, explaining the Master Plan and zoning process to the attendees at the meeting at Allen School.

As a resident of Ann Arbor, I am hopeful that all new development can abide by the Energy Commission guidelines. It is my understanding that the zoning ordinance lags behind the city's sustainability goals, and this presents a problem in general.

However, it also sounds like **the builder's PUD review for 2857 Packard Road could be a golden opportunity to apply many of the city's energy efficiency goals**, especially Net Zero Affordable Housing. If I am understanding this correctly, perhaps the Planning Commission and City Council could ask for the following revisions in exchange for the increased housing density:

1. Solar ready - buildings reoriented on site so that a south-facing roof is available for solar panel installation.
2. All electric - even if gas lines are required in the building code, construct homes so that they could be entirely solar powered in the near future.
3. Preserve trees as possible, with flexibility to replace landmark/native trees that shade solar opportunities.
4. Add small floor plan units to make lower cost housing more accessible.

I sincerely hope the units built on this site support Ann Arbor's reduced carbon emission and clean energy goals, and that Peters Building Company embraces this opportunity to produce an infill residential project that is a national model for progressive, sustainable housing.

Thank you again for your time and patience.

Jennifer Wolf

**Lenart, Brett**

---

**From:** Matt Grocoff <m.grocoff@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 11, 2019 10:58 AM  
**To:** Clevey, Mark (EC)  
**Cc:** Planning; Stults, Missy; Eaton, Jack; Ackerman, Zach; Grand, Julie; Mirsky, John  
**Subject:** Re: Solar Readiness

All electric buildings should be bumped to #1.

Top priority in the short term is strict end to new gas infrastructure; all-electric is a pre-condition to meeting Paris targets and is explicitly called for in the Paris Accords. While not all buildings will be able to have solar access, no building can be powered with off-site renewable energy if it has gas infrastructure.

Gas infrastructure is a single fuel option and that fuel is incompatible with meeting the demands of Climate Crisis.

Here's a landmark report from Rocky Mountain Institute that shows electric construction to be lower cost and lower carbon.

<https://rmi.org/report-release-electrifying-buildings-for-decarbonization/>

On Thu, Jun 6, 2019, 9:39 PM Mark Clevey <[mclevey123@gmail.com](mailto:mclevey123@gmail.com)> wrote:  
Brett:

It was a pleasure to hear your presentation and to talk with you at the Packard Development meeting tonight. The problem I found with the Packard Development is the same with others that I have reviewed: *lack of Solar Readiness*. Every structure that is not Solar Ready (i.e., solar compatible) will be shackled, for its entire life-cycle, to climate change causing fossil fuel generated electricity or, at a much higher cost, DTE owned renewable energy (most likely wind energy). *By definition, non-Solar Ready developments are not compatible with either Ann Arbor's Climate Action Plan or new Sustainability Plan and, as such, contribute to climate change risks.*

Within this context, I would recommend that the City Council, Planning Commission and Planning Department consider requiring the Packard Development developer, and any and all developers for and and all future developments in the city, to ensure that *every structure in their proposed development be Solar Ready*:

1. All main roofs face south with sufficient roof space to accommodate enough solar panels to meet the expected building electrical needs;
2. Buildings are all electric (HVAC, Appliances, Electric Vehicle Charging, etc.);
3. Buildings are Battery Storage ready; and,
3. Any trees that need to be removed to accommodate the Solar Readiness be replaced on the east or west sides of buildings.

## Lenart, Brett

---

**From:** eileen kreiner <kreinemk@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 13, 2019 10:15 AM  
**To:** Lenart, Brett  
**Subject:** Allen Community Meeting on June 6th and Packard Re-zoning

Dear Mr. Lenart,

Thank you for providing information on the zoning process and for being patient with us at the Allen meeting. You can tell the community is worked up regarding the development of 2857 Packard Road.

While I appreciate the right of the owner to develop, yet I hope that a small woodlot may be incorporated into the plan which would include some of those huge old oak trees. We need to preserve as much habitat as is possible for a healthy community. The density of homes is troubling.

As I have indicated to others in previous e-mails, I bought my house because of that property, and have marveled at the abundance of flora and fauna ever since. I support the zoning change to PUD so that there can be some negotiation regarding the "plan."

Other concerns include traffic, safe access to school for children, integrity of the surrounding community, plus that property is surrounded by fencing. I anticipate wire-cutters and other property damage.

Please forward to Alex Milshteyn. I will also e-mail Julie Grand and Zachary Ackerman on City Council.

Thank you for your attention,  
Eileen Kreiner  
2889 Easy St

PS. I do plan on attending the meeting on June 18th

## Lenart, Brett

---

**From:** Neil Skov <skov@umich.edu>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 17, 2019 2:30 PM  
**To:** Planning  
**Cc:** Cheng, Christopher; Lenart, Brett  
**Subject:** Comments on Project # Z19-008

Ann Arbor City Planning Commission:

I am unable to attend the Planning Commission hearing regarding the proposed PUD project at 2857 Packard Road, scheduled for 7:00 PM on Tuesday, 18 June 2019, so I am sending my thoughts concerning the project to you in this e-mail message.

My wife and i reside at 2728 Cranbrook Road, which is at the north-east corner of the proposed Planned Unit Development. We have lived in that residence since September 1976, and plan to stay there as long as we are able.

While we prefer the land at the 2857 Packard Road address be classified R1B, as originally zoned, we recognize that classification is not likely to happen. We also acknowledge the project proposal currently under consideration has many merits that were absent in previous proposals.

From our vantage point there are four items we would like you to consider as you deliberate over the project proposal:

1. We believe it is important to retain a fence along the east and north boundaries of the PUD site. When we purchased our home it was important to us that there be a fenced-in back yard for our young children and dog. While our children are grown, having a fenced-in yard for a dog is still important to us. We also note that many homes in our neighborhood are occupied by dog owners and families with young children.
2. Our second concern also relates to the fences along the east and north sides of the project site. Page three of the revised site plan dated 5/31/19 states that the existing fences do not lie along the project site property lines. Having worked in the natural sciences my entire fifty-year professional life, I know there is no such thing as an exact measurement. For every measurement there is a degree of tolerance or uncertainty. When my wife and I purchased our home, we had to have the homesite surveyed in order to obtain a mortgage. The same is true of our nearest neighbor. However, when our neighbor and I compared our two survey reports we found they do not agree on where the property boundary exists between our two lots. Nevertheless, we have happily lived the past 43 years assuming the property boundaries are the fence lines that existed when we purchased our home. Whose surveyor has ultimate authority in establishing property boundaries, and at what point in time do long-used boundary indicators (e.g., fence lines) become permanent?
3. What, if any, effects do infiltration and detention basins have on the mosquito population in the surrounding neighborhoods?
4. On the Landscape Plan (page 19 of the revised PUD site plan), has consideration been given to the mature heights of the trees to be planted along the eastern and northern site borders? There is a utility easement along those boundaries with overhead power and communication lines.

Thank you for your consideration,



## Lenart, Brett

---

**From:** dsandjd@comcast.net  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 16, 2019 8:16 PM  
**To:** Planning  
**Cc:** Jeannette Duane  
**Subject:** Please read my letter concerning development at 2857 Packard

Please give a copy to each person on the Planning Commission.

June 16, 2019

Jeannette Duane

2744 Kimberley Rd.

Ann Arbor, MI 48104

To: Brett Lenart and Planning Department

Alex Milshteyn and Planning Commission

All City Council Representatives

Regarding : Rezoning consideration to PUD for 2857 Packard/ Peter's Building proposed development

Please be careful as you consider the next step in the approval process for this development. Set high expectations and requirements, not "requests" or "recommendations", in any negotiations with this plan and developer. Ask for more than what you hope to get with this. From reading the documents in the history of this process, I see many iterations of this developer ignoring "requests" or "recommendations". His inability or unwillingness to respect Natural Features preservation is one example. Take a hard negotiating position.

I just saw in recent documents that the likely asking price for these "units" is now \$350,000 to \$450,000. This is up from \$280,000 when first proposed. When you granted rezoning to R1E, one strong reason was so that this would not end up as a high-priced, "giant-house on medium-lot" development. You wanted the development to honor an important goal of the city's Master Plan – housing that was priced within reach of a more diverse economic population. Now you are looking at a high-priced, "medium-house on tiny-lot" development with houses packed in like sardines. Is that what you are going to accept after all the work you have put into your city Master Plan, and development codes? The plan shows 2 car garages and room for 2 cars in the driveway as well – for 51 units on a 7-acre parcel. Do you think people will be taking the bus when they spend \$450,000 for their houses? This proposal fails at your goals.

The developer's move for a PUD zoning sounds like an attempt to try to get what he wants, without giving what he needs to. Is there a walkway planned now through the middle housing section for the east side homeowners to access the larger open space, as was "requested" several times by the planning department? The presence of an historic dwelling (not "officially" designated so, but historic nonetheless) on the site has not been addressed though concerned neighbors and preservationists have pleaded for an opportunity to discuss a way to move and preserve the structure. Granted the dwelling is not being sold to the builder, but the city staff in charge could advocate for this and include it as part of a rezoning deal.

The traffic impact will be significant and problematic to our extended neighborhood. The developer did submit a study, and the city approved it. I believe that was a mistake. Requiring a slightly lower density of housing is one way you could lessen the traffic impact without having to solve the larger, city-wide traffic issue first. I know that the idea of higher density housing is, in some ways, a way to address the out-of-town commuting traffic. Yet, I doubt that at the \$450,000 price point, this development would be a place that many earners who now commute to Ann Arbor could afford to live. Are you really getting anything for our city's Master Plan from this development? And I haven't even delved into the depth of the "Natural Features Preservation", disregard.

I am sorry I am unable to attend the meeting on June 18<sup>th</sup>. I know this letter is a bit heavy-handed, but this would be the tone of my Public Comments if I were able to make them in person.

Thank you for your attention and consideration of this matter. I do believe that you are well intentioned and that you care about the city. Please proceed carefully, consider your constituents, and act with authority.

Jeannette Duane