From:	Julie Ritter
То:	<u>CityCouncil; Lenart, Brett; Brian Chambers; Delacourt, Derek; Diane Brainard; Stults, Missy; Erica Briggs; Hanzel, Hillary; Jeannine Palms; Lisa Suave; Scott Reisfeld; Smith, Colin; Gott, Sue (U of M); Wendy Carman; Christine Crockett; Eleanor Pollack; Elleanor Crown; Ilene Tyler; Jeff Crockett; Lars; Mary Ivers; Nick Coquillard; Detter, Ray; Steve Kaplan; Susan Wineberg; David Kennedy; Planning; WAP</u>
Subject:	Fwd: Proposal to Create a T1 Zoning District
Date:	Monday, September 30, 2019 8:58:00 AM
Attachments:	Ordinance to Create T1 District.pdf Staff Report on T1 District 9-16-19.pdf

I am writing to you as a member of the Master Plan Consultant Choice Process, and a resident of downtown Ann Arbor.

Yesterday, while at a meeting of the Ward Representatives on the Master Plan consultant choice committee, I received the following email from Jeff Crockett. My question is, why are we bothering with a Master Plan process at all?

The fact that someone, some faction, whomever, within the City and its various organizations, is going ahead, in spite of the Master Plan review process currently underway, and introducing a significant new zoning category, along with identifying locations where it is intended to be implemented, all without any identifiable public input, just takes my breath away.

It has been suggested to me that this zoning, which is a transit corridor zoning, could also be selectively applied in places where other kinds of mixed use zoning are not appropriate. Putting a transit zoning into a selective location is just as problematic. To my understanding transit zoning is meant to be used along a transit route.

And Ann Arbor does not even have any public transit (light rail, commuter rail, monorail) nor have I heard even a whisper of such being developed.

AATA struggles valiantly to fulfill the role of bus service, regional transit (between Ypsilanti, Ann Arbor, Dexter, etc) and public transit. It does an outstanding job in the center of its service area but there is no funding for the level of service that is being requested for outlying areas. And it is certainly not regional transit.

And this comes at a time when both the City and the University are proposing at least three significant buildings in the downtown area without any parking provided:

- The hotel proposed for the Firestone site
- The new hospital at Ann and Zina Pitcher
- The new College of Pharmacy at Glen and Huron

Just because there is these buildings are proposed "to force people to take alternative transportation" and just because the City passes T1 zoning, none of this makes any difference without a robust, significant, effective public transit service. Right now there really is no alternative transportation for them to take.

Minneapolis, Palo Alto, Boulder, Austin, Boston, etc all have strong, regional and local public transit in the form of light rail kinds of things in addition to buses and ride hailing. That is what allows their transit zoning to work. Trying to shoehorn this new zoning into Ann Arbor without such a resource is going to create a nightmare.

I already live in a neighborhood near the University and Downtown that is "parked up" 24/7/363 (Christmas Day and Thanksgiving Day there might be some vacancies). We have Ubers, pizza delivery services, friends and relatives all for the condominiums next to our house, parking in our driveway, because it is easier for them to make us come out and ask them to move if we need to leave or enter, than it is for them to find a parking space within less than a couple of blocks. I have heard the same situation exists in the neighborhoods south of Central Campus.

Since even with T1 zoning there is no way for residents to get into or out of the City without a car, this zoning is not going to help traffic or parking one tiny bit with all these new developments not providing parking. Where are

people coming into town going to park their cars? Will they have to park in Brighton or Dexter and take a shuttle bus into town?

Time and again in City communications, stakeholders are identified as separate from citizen residents. Here is another example. Why citizens are routinely excluded from these kinds of processes is another mystery.

I'm sorry this email is so poorly organized and covers such a wide range of topics. I have been immersed in all these issues, and more, for months. To have the planning department throw a whole new zoning category, one that deeply affects traffic and parking in addition to transportation, into the mix at this point has me still trying to sort out what is going on.

On top of all of this, isn't the City in the middle of a major Transportation Plan? Is that as meaningless as the Master Plan process?

I am trying to be respectful. It is hard when I do not feel respected myself. I and all the committee members and consultant groups have spent countless hours over the last five months working on the master plan consultant choice and we are not done yet. This kind of significant zoning change coming in the middle of our process and the middle of the Transportation Plan, is disrespectful to me and all the other people involved in these City initiated processes. How can we even imagine that the City takes what we do seriously?

It may well be that after the completion of the Transportation Plan and the Master Plan, these new zoning changes are put through appropriate public process and adopted wholeheartedly. It may well be that these are the best solutions to the numerous planning challenges facing the City. But they will have been vetted by all impacted parties, not just the planning department and the property owners/developers.

Do we expect things to come to a stop? Certainly not. But to have an entirely new and deeply impactful (for site development, for character overlays, for transportation) zoning category proposed at this time, along with identifying places it will be applied, without any identifiable public input, pretty much makes our work insignificant.

As respectfully as possible,

Julie Ritter

----- Forwarded message ------

From: Jeff Crockett <jeffcrockett8@gmail.com>

Date: Sun, Sep 29, 2019 at 6:28 PM

Subject: Proposal to Create a T1 Zoning District

To: Bethany Osborne <<u>bosborneusa@gmail.com</u>>, Christine Crockett

<<u>christinecrockett8@gmail.com</u>>, David Kennedy <<u>david@kennedycare.com</u>>, Elleanor

Crown <<u>ecrown@umich.edu</u>>, Ilene R. Tyler <<u>ilene.tyler@gmail.com</u>>, Julie Ritter

<<u>ritter.julie@gmail.com</u>>, Lars Bjorn <<u>lbjorn@umich.edu</u>>, Nick Coquillard

<<u>gm@icc.coop</u>>, Ray Detter <<u>rdetter@umich.edu</u>>, Steve Kaplan

<<u>asherdanielkaplan@gmail.com</u>>, Susan Wineberg <<u>swines@umich.edu</u>>

On Tuesday, the Planning Commission is considering the creation of a T1 Zoning district. I was able to get a copy of the proposed ordinance and the staff report. See attached. Whether you agree or not with T1 zoning, I am concerned with the lack of public input in the development of this proposal. The intent is to create more density along main transportation

routes and it deserves serious consideration. I intend to send an email to the PC tomorrow with my concerns. As time allows, please take a look. What do you think?

## Note the following sections:

1. "Over time, Planning staff worked with numerous stakeholders to draft a new district, including representatives from the Planning Commission and the Housing and Human Services Advisory Board."

## Comment: Who were the numerous stakeholders other than the PC and HHSAB? It appears that no neighborhood associations had an opportunity to provide input. These documents were released on Friday, which provides for extremely limited public scrutiny. That's a significant problem.

2. "It is envisioned that the T1 district would be immediately appropriate for South State Street corridor, including extensions along East and West Eisenhower Boulevard, and the Washtenaw Avenue corridor. Property owners, or those with permission from property owners, could apply to rezone their land to T1. Also, rezonings could be initiated by City Council or the Planning Commission. (See UDC Section 5.29.9.B) The T1 district may also be appropriate, or a similar district with tailored with adjustments

could be created (i.e., a T2 or T3 district), for the West Stadium Boulevard, Plymouth Road, Packard Street, and Ann Arbor-Saline Road corridors. Just like South State Street, Eisenhower Boulevards, and Washtenaw Avenue, these are all signature transit routes with fixed bus service that could accommodate and need increased development density and supporting amenities."

## Comment: What defines a corridor? The T1 zoning applies to the streets mentioned above but can it apply to housing in the vicinity of these corridors? If vicinity, what is the distance from these main streets that could be considered T1? This may be a huge loophole.

3. According to the attached Table, the max height for T1 is 80 for buildings within 300 residential areas. There is no height limit for buildings more than 300 feet.

Comment: The caption in the table on the T1 specs (see attached) reads "NOTE: The requirements in this table may be superseded by the standards in Section error Reference source not found." Consequently, there is no way to tell what standard(s) would supersede the T1 zoning.

## **Overall Statement:**

I object to the lack of citizen input in the development of this T1 zoning, the short time frame to access the staff report, the lack of definition of a corridor and whether or not it can be applied to areas in the vicinity of the zoning corridors, and the incomplete Table 5:17-4. I am going to send an email to the PC requesting at least a first and second reading which will be open for public input.

Jeff

Have the courage to make your life a blessing - The Siddur

---