

01 January 2020

Ann Arbor Planning Commission  
Ann Arbor, MI  
[planning@a2gov.org](mailto:planning@a2gov.org)

RE: Letter of Support for Garnett Site Plan and Rezoning

Dear Planning Commission Members:

I am in full support of the proposed project for developing the Garnet Building site. I spent substantial time reviewing the proposal with Kelly Anderson.

Kelly Anderson  
KLA Building Development  
345 Glenwood Street  
Ann Arbor, MI 48103  
[www.kladevelopment.com](http://www.kladevelopment.com)  
734-260-2432  
[kladev@msn.com](mailto:kladev@msn.com)

This is a high quality proposal that is thoughtfully planned with respect to existing structures and proposed developments within the same area of Ann Arbor. It is a valuable contribution to the existing neighborhood.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Stephen C. Bayne". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Stephen C. Bayne, PhD.  
641 N 5<sup>th</sup> Ave  
Ann Arbor, MI 48104-1020  
734-649-8595  
[sbayne@umich.edu](mailto:sbayne@umich.edu)

Kim Mayes  
dba Urban Rider Cargo Bikes  
407 N. Fifth Ave.  
Ann Arbor, MI 48104  
kim@urbanrider.bike

January 3, 2020

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing in support of the proposed building known as, "The Garnet," proposed for 325 E. Summit, in Ann Arbor. As a business owner in the Kerrytown District, I welcome housing development in the neighborhood, and believe that this particular building will be an attractive addition to the local architecture. I believe that higher density housing is a benefit to the city, and I don't see any credible reason not to redevelop that particular property.

Sincerely,

Kim Mayes



Dear Planning Commission members,

I am writing on behalf of the owners of 912, 920, 924, and 944 N. Main St., which are the building to the west of the new proposed Garnet Building at Broadway and Summit. We offer our support and encouragement of both the PUD rezoning and approval of the project as proposed. We have met with the development team and project architect and believe that this high quality project that will have a positive impact on our neighborhood. If you have any questions I can be reached via email [dla@nomares.com](mailto:dla@nomares.com) or at my office 734/882.8888.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink that reads "Douglas Allen".

Douglas Allen, Owner  
NOMA Real Estate Services

1/20/20 -- Sent to Planning Staff for Planning Commission and City Council

#### The Garnet - Site Plan vs. Traffic Safety

In reviewing the site plan for the Garnet development, we have significant concerns about the proximity of the proposed building to Broadway St., and the effect on safety at the intersection of Broadway / Beakes, E. Summit, and Detroit streets. Visibility at this intersection is difficult as it is. Traveling southwest on Broadway down the incline from the Broadway bridge, it is difficult to see the intersection of E. Summit, and there are crosswalks on both sides of E. Summit, plus cars and bikes entering there or from the N. Division cut-through.

The Garnet site plan indicates the building front set-back from Broadway is 7.18 feet, and the height will be about 50 feet above the sidewalk. (The existing single-family building on the site is 63 feet from Broadway; it is not visible from Broadway and therefore is not a visual impediment to vehicle traffic. Front set-back minimums for Residential zoning range from 15 to 40 feet.)

There is no indication in the staff report that any review of traffic impact was done, and the Citizen Participation meeting Q & A states a Traffic Study was not warranted.

There is already significant vehicle traffic on Broadway / Beakes, which will only increase with the development at Lower Town, and the expected development of the former DTE site.

Given the City's goals for pedestrian and bicycle safety, and concerns about traffic congestion, it seems very short-sighted to not evaluate the potential impact of new buildings that abut high traffic roads like Broadway at the Broadway Bridge.

A front set-back of only 7 feet from Broadway does not seem adequate from a traffic safety perspective. The size and the set-back location of the proposed building, relative to traffic (pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicle) safety on the surrounding roads, need to be evaluated before site-plan approval is considered.

Thank you for considering our concerns,

Lynn Borset

Charles Compton (UMTRI retiree)

Ward 5

GarnetTrafficSafety.doc

**Lenart, Brett**

---

**From:** Jeffrey Benko <jeffrey.benko@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 27, 2020 10:05 AM  
**To:** CityCouncil; Planning  
**Subject:** Re: Marijuana Ordinances and 702 S. Main Street

Hi,

I wanted to resend this email as its initial delivery was just before the New Year's holidays. I have been discussing this with my neighbors and many share my view as the site for 702 S Main street is inappropriate for a Recreational Marijuana site. It would be appreciated if we could understand how the city ordinances support the themes of Proposal 2 of local communities/neighborhoods controlling if recreational retailers are permitted and a strong buffer between these sites and children's locations such as schools and homes are maintained.

Thank you,  
Jeff Benko  
5th Ward  
213 W Madison St  
734-649-4147

On Mon, Dec 16, 2019 at 12:06 PM Jeffrey Benko <[jeffrey.benko@gmail.com](mailto:jeffrey.benko@gmail.com)> wrote:  
To Ann Arbor City Council and Planning Commission:

These statements are based on the following understanding of the facts:

- 702 S. Main Street has been given a Special Use Exception for Medical Marijuana but has not applied for a permit yet as of Nov 20, 2019.
- The City has amended code to provide that a medical provisioning center can become a recreational sales center without any new permit or amendment to the existing special exception use permit.
- Thus there is no means for the neighborhood to oppose this location from becoming a recreational retailer.

I was dismayed to find this out. I had been engaged with this location's Special Use Exception permit process. I attended and publicly spoke at a Planning Commission meeting, voiced concerns, and engaged the owner of the business. In the end, I reluctantly allowed this process to complete without formally opposing it. If the permit would have been to become a recreational retailer though, I would have strongly opposed it and sought to organize a neighborhood response.

There are major differences between a medical provisioning center and a recreational retailer.

- The potential customers goes from a limited number of Michiganders with prescriptions to all Michiganders over the age of 21. With over 1400 communities not allowing recreational sales in their locales, supply is limited as well and likely this location will see traffic coming from outside of Ann Arbor. The 702 S. Main street location is zoned for a "neighborhood business" and is not meant to house businesses drawing outside customers.
- This site is also in close proximity to homes and does not provide a buffer to shield children as was a major intent of the proposal.

To not require a second permit process for the recreational retailer is simply wrong in my opinion and I would think for many residents of Ann Arbor. The ballot proposal had strong themes of protecting children and not