

**From:** [ron@sovakemaus.name](mailto:ron@sovakemaus.name) <[ron@sovakemaus.name](mailto:ron@sovakemaus.name)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 10, 2020 8:14 AM  
**To:** Planning <[Planning@a2gov.org](mailto:Planning@a2gov.org)>  
**Cc:** Grand, Julie <[JGrand@a2gov.org](mailto:JGrand@a2gov.org)>  
**Subject:** affordable housing

Dear Commissioners,

I participated in the citizens advisory group established by the County to determine the fate of the property on Platt Rd at the site of the former Juvenile Detention and Court. I am also a neighbor to the site on the corner of Hampshire Rd and Canterbury.

Many neighbors opposed development of the site especially for affordable housing which they equate with low income and with all the bias and prejudice that comes with the pejorative references to 'those people.' They will talk about keeping open space, falling home values, traffic and many other myths that simply mask their unwarranted fears. It is with this backdrop in mind that I would like you to read the following byline from John Eligon of the New York Times about an affordable housing development in New Berlin, WI.

From The New York Times: Residents Feared Low-Income Housing Would Ruin Their Suburb. It Didn't. President Trump told suburban voters that affordable housing would hurt property values and increase crime. The story of one Wisconsin community challenges those assumptions.

<https://www.nytimes.com/2020/11/05/us/affordable-housing-suburbs.html?smid=em-share> This article convinces me that the County needs to do more to promote attractive and decent affordable housing in Ann Arbor and all the communities surrounding Ann Arbor. I hope it helps convince you too.

I have been watching the building of the homes further south on Platt Rd that are next to Swift Run Creek. It looks like a wonderful development that exemplifies the article's message.

Please keep these developments in mind when future proposals come before you for review.

Sincerely,  
Ron Emaus  
2503 Hampshire Rd  
Ann Arbor MI 48104  
734.678.3419

**From:** [marentis@gmail.com](mailto:marentis@gmail.com) <[marentis@gmail.com](mailto:marentis@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 11, 2020 12:30 PM  
**To:** Planning <[Planning@a2gov.org](mailto:Planning@a2gov.org)>  
**Subject:** RE: Proposed hotel mixed use spaces question

Dear city of AA planning,

I am an owner at 111 N Ashley and was excited about the new adjacent hotel development at 300 W Huron, until I found out there are no mixed use spaces, just hotel rooms.

As proposed it seems like an underutilization of prime real estate that maybe marginally if any improves downtown...

Can you please forward this to the appropriate team? Whom else should I contact?

Sincerely,

Theo Marentis

Dear Theo,

Thank you for taking the time to respond to our resident participation mailer for the proposed Fairfield Inn & Suites Hotel, located at the corner of First and Huron. We appreciate your suggestions and feedback. Unfortunately, due to the limited amount of space available in the lobby, it is not feasible to add a restaurant, bar or café, and due to the D2 zoning building height restrictions, we do not have sufficient room to accommodate a rooftop patio.

The proposed project will be LEED Gold Certified and will also provide an improved pedestrian focused streetscape along First Street. Streetscape improvements will include an increased sidewalk width, additional bike parking, pedestrian seating, and additional street trees.

Thank you again for your participation and we look forward to being a part of the old west side neighborhood.

## Nederveld

800.222.1868  
[www.nederveld.com](http://www.nederveld.com)

**From:** [marentis@gmail.com](mailto:marentis@gmail.com) <[marentis@gmail.com](mailto:marentis@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 29, 2020 8:56 PM  
**To:** 300WHuronQuestions <[300WHuronQuestions@nederveld.com](mailto:300WHuronQuestions@nederveld.com)>  
**Subject:** Proposed hotel public spaces question

Dear Nederveld,

We are excited to hear about the potential development of a new hotel! We are neighbors just adjacent in the 111 N Ashley building.

Just wondering, and hoping (?) that the new hotel development contains mixed- use spaces that enhance the neighborhood and the hotel. For example a restaurant, café, bar, rooftop, or small retail space would be great additions to a hotel and the neighborhood.

The more established hotels in downtown AA such as the Graduate and the Bell Tower offer these, and it's a wonderful way to bring people in the hotel and make it a lively and exciting place to be, especially when business is slower.

Let us know and we look forward to hearing your ideas!

Best,

Theo

**From:** Sue Perry <[sueperry@comcast.net](mailto:sueperry@comcast.net)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 12, 2020 7:43 PM  
**To:** Planning <[Planning@a2gov.org](mailto:Planning@a2gov.org)>  
**Subject:** 2060 W. Stadium/my letter to Northstar

Please make our following letter a part of the record for the proposed bank and storage warehouse at 2060 W. Stadium.

This is to be considered on November 17th by your commission. Thank you.

=====

=====

TO: Northstar Bank and affiliates

RE: Your proposed plans for 2060 W. Stadium, Ann Arbor

We would love to welcome Northstar Bank to our community. Specifically, to our Westside community in Ann Arbor. We know you consider yourselves a community bank as stated in your history and mission statements. We would like to see you off to a good start with positive feelings and support -- now and for years to come -- rather than the recent negative feelings from the immediate neighbors and Westside citizens. It's up to you. You can come and build something quite inappropriate, out of scale and character, and abhorrent to most of us -- indeed signalling that *community* is not a genuine concern of Northstar -- or you could earnestly and honestly engage our total westside community in a more robust and inclusive conversation to come up with something that works for all of us. As planned, your building would be a daily reminder of the out-of-town bank that built an eyesore in our midst by doing what best served it's needs -- not the needs of our community -- as well as an enduring and timeless legacy for Northstar.

There are so many other plans that would be a good fit for this site. A small retail center. A small medical-dental building. A nice restaurant. An affordable retail area for local boutique stores and local artists ( which would really score you huge points with the locals !! ). But for now, there have been many words to describe our feelings about your proposed plans -- "alarmed" "angered" "appalled" -- are but a few. (Many of us have only recently become aware of your plans since they are now on the agenda of the Planning Commission -- nor were we part of the few that were notified in writing some months ago).

You should know that Stadium Boulevard, between Pauline and Dexter, is considered by a vast number residents in west and northwest Ann Arbor, to be our main shopping district -- our "downtown" if you will.

We have been proud and pleased with numerous improvements and additions to this area in past years -- attractive new street lighting, road paving, pedestrian islands and cross walks, new and updated buildings including the new Big Georges appliance store, the new Reinhart Realtors building, a new drug store, the rehabilitation of Maple Village Shopping Center and all it's new retailers, the former Burger Chef now under construction for a new eatery, and more.

This is where we "westsiders" go for much or most of our local shopping and service needs -- groceries, hardware, drug stores, post office, restaurants, hair salons, auto services,

pizza/ice cream, vets/pet supplies, and much more. We have known some of these business owners for many years; we greet each other by name, and are loyal to their stores and services.

Why build a bank when there are eight existing banks/credit unions a stone throw's away - - - Bank of Ann Arbor, Fifth Third Bank, Lake Trust Credit Union, Comerica Bank, TCF Bank, Bank of America, Level One Bank, and Key Bank ? ( And, yet another credit union has already been recently city-approved for West Stadium.)

Why build a mammoth and towering self-storage warehouse in such an inappropriate location? Is the income from this meant to compensate for what might be an unprofitable bank ? Or to help recoup a portion of the \$6,000,000.00 ( six million ) paid for the property ? Most, if not all, self-storage businesses are not located adjacent to residential areas or in the midst of prime retail properties - - they are most always located adjacent to expressways, or in big-box store/mall areas, or industrial areas, etc, etc. A recent poll of self-storage businesses shows that there are plenty of available storage units available.  
Most of us are at a loss to explain your plans. What is it we do not know ?

Lastly, there are some concerns about soil contamination on this site. There is a small storage shed in the rear that contained numerous 50 gallon drums of ?????. Apparently not something the previous owners wanted to store inside. The barrels have recently been removed. There are also large storage tanks inside the building still containing solvents and other liquids. This was a business that had heavy use of gas, oil, solvents, industrial paints, likely toxins - - for many, many years. We would hope that the appropriate environmental agencies are involved.

We hope you are able to take a step back and reconsider your plans. We could be your strongest supporters if your plans reflected a true concern, appreciation, and acknowledgement of our community. It can be done.

Susan A. Perry and friends  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48103

**From:** Love Ramirez <[kentanddiego@gmail.com](mailto:kentanddiego@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 08, 2020 9:17 PM  
**To:** Lenart, Brett <[BLenart@a2gov.org](mailto:BLenart@a2gov.org)>  
**Cc:** Taylor, Christopher (Mayor) <[CTaylor@a2gov.org](mailto:CTaylor@a2gov.org)>; Hayner, Jeff <[JHayner@a2gov.org](mailto:JHayner@a2gov.org)>; Griswold, Kathy <[KGriswold@a2gov.org](mailto:KGriswold@a2gov.org)>; Grand, Julie <[JGrand@a2gov.org](mailto:JGrand@a2gov.org)>; Nelson, Elizabeth <[ENelson@a2gov.org](mailto:ENelson@a2gov.org)>; Ramlawi, Ali <[ARamlawi@a2gov.org](mailto:ARamlawi@a2gov.org)>; Planning <[Planning@a2gov.org](mailto:Planning@a2gov.org)>; Cheng, Christopher <[CCheng@a2gov.org](mailto:CCheng@a2gov.org)>; Disch, Lisa <[LDisch@a2gov.org](mailto:LDisch@a2gov.org)>; Song, Linh <[LSong@a2gov.org](mailto:LSong@a2gov.org)>; Radina, Travis <[TRadina@a2gov.org](mailto:TRadina@a2gov.org)>; Eyer, Jen <[JEyer@a2gov.org](mailto:JEyer@a2gov.org)>; Briggs, Erica <[EBriggs@a2gov.org](mailto:EBriggs@a2gov.org)>; Bannister, Anne <[ABannister@a2gov.org](mailto:ABannister@a2gov.org)>; Lumm, Jane <[JLumm@a2gov.org](mailto:JLumm@a2gov.org)>; Ackerman, Zach <[ZAckerman@a2gov.org](mailto:ZAckerman@a2gov.org)>; Eaton, Jack <[JEaton@a2gov.org](mailto:JEaton@a2gov.org)>; Smith, Chip <[ChSmith@a2gov.org](mailto:ChSmith@a2gov.org)>  
**Subject:** Opposed to NorthStadium development, 2060 W. Stadium

Brett Lenart, City Planning Commission,

As homeowners in the Ivywood/Dartmoor neighborhood, we wish to express our strong opposition to the proposed development by NorthStadium LLC at 2060 W. Stadium. We own the adjacent residential property at 1919 Ivywood Drive.

There are many reasons we oppose this development, including that it is out of scale with the existing development along that portion of the Stadium corridor, especially buildings adjacent to a residential neighborhood, but we wish to speak specifically to concerns related to our property and neighboring properties.

The schematics presented by the developer during the community conversation include sightline impacts from street level, but all of the properties adjacent to the development slope up to a property line on the ridge, which is where the true impact becomes clear. Obstructed views from the street level are somewhat irrelevant. Backyard impact is what matters most for those with adjacent properties, especially two-story homes like ours. As you can see in the image below, if this development is approved, it will create an unsightly four-story concrete wall along our property line.

It also is of grave concern that the developer is requesting the property be rezoned to allow them to build even closer to residential properties. It was distressing enough that Wright Tree/DTE recently decimated the tree line, leaving tree trunks with minimal branches that will surely die in the coming years (unrelated to proposed development, but relevant to the state of the ridgeline, photos below), but now we're faced with even more encroachment on the natural backyard beauty that sold us on our property.

And a larger public storage facility is not at all in line with the surrounding commercial properties or needs of nearby residents. The developer anticipates 80 percent residential use, yet in expressing our opposition during conversations with neighbors, we have not come across a single resident in the vicinity of the development who supports the development or plans to use the resulting storage facility. Additionally, there are no less than six self storage facilities within 2-3 miles of the proposed development, including a Public Storage on S. Industrial, none of which are adjacent to residential neighborhoods.

Please add us to any notifications as this proposal is considered.

Kent and Diego Love-Ramirez  
1919 Ivywood Drive  
Ann Arbor, MI 48103



Backyard view of proposed four-story development.



Second floor view of proposed four-story development



Decimation by Wright Tree (topped mature trees, removed branches on one side, left just enough so they didn't have to remove them, but they clearly will not survive)



Decimation by Wright Tree (topped mature trees, removed branches on one side, left just enough so they didn't have to remove them, but they clearly will not survive)

**From:** [Lenart, Brett](#)  
**To:** [David Olmstead](#)  
**Cc:** [Cheng, Christopher](#); [Gale, Mia](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Objections to Simultaneous Public Hearings on Proposed Development and Rezoning at 2060 West Stadium  
**Date:** Friday, November 13, 2020 2:32:29 PM

---

Hello Mr. Olmstead-

The Planning Commission will be holding a public hearing prior to recommendation or any final action. In addition to the public hearing opportunity, comments may be provided via email to [planning@a2gov.org](mailto:planning@a2gov.org) or to the “ecomment” mechanism available on the City’s website.

Additional public hearings will be held at the City Council to provide distinct, separate public hearing opportunities for both the rezoning and site plan review. I will also share these comments with the Planning Commission.

Sincerely,

**Brett Lenart, AICP | Planning Manager**  
City of Ann Arbor Planning Services  
301 E. Huron Street, P.O. Box 8647  
Ann Arbor, MI 48107-8647

[blenart@a2gov.org](mailto:blenart@a2gov.org) | Direct (734) 794-6000 #42606 | General (734) 794-6265 | [www.a2gov.org](http://www.a2gov.org)

---

**From:** David Olmstead <reachdo@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, November 13, 2020 1:49 PM  
**To:** Cheng, Christopher <CCheng@a2gov.org>; Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>  
**Subject:** Objections to Simultaneous Public Hearings on Proposed Development and Rezoning at 2060 West Stadium

This message was sent from outside of the City of Ann Arbor. Please do not click links, open attachments, or follow directions unless you recognize the source of this email and know the content is safe.

Mr. Cheng,

I have sent you two emails on this subject. I thank you for your prompt reply to each.

In my first email, I asked and you answered as follows:

If Nov 17 is the public hearing on the site plan, is it also the public hearing on the application for rezoning of a P portion of the property to CB2? Yes, both are being heard

In my second email, sent prior to your answer to my first email, I more clearly stated my question and added my concern, as follows:

Are the two public hearings to be combined, concurrent and simultaneous? If this is the case, I question and request CPC authority to do this. These are two distinct questions, requiring distinct analysis and opportunity to comment. Running them concurrently would put the public at severe disadvantage. The effects would be a citizen's right to comment will be cut in half, and even if the hearings are separated, not knowing what hearing comes first, means a citizen does not know how to prepare one's comments.

The proposed plan and rezoning are each distinct and complex subjects for a proposed project of this magnitude. The public must be given full opportunity to be heard, not artificially limited by b[1]ending Code hearing requirements.

To this question and concern you responded:

Both the rezoning, special exception use and the site plan are heard by the City Planning Commission ... The public will have an opportunity to speak at this meeting and please note the Planning Commission is a recommending body.

I respectfully say, I being far less informed on this subject than you, that you did not offer a clear response to my clear question, and did not indicate that there will be any follow-up to my request for CPC's authority to hold these two hearings simultaneously, as your email implies CPC intends to do.

I and numerous neighbors object to simultaneous

hearings and the notice contents and procedure that has created such confusion at this stage. We explicitly request information on CPC's authority to do this.

This is likely not the first time CPC has held simultaneous hearings on two distinct matters. If so, presumably there is a legal opinion from City Council or a court opinion which provides such authority. Or possibly, given that the UDC was not adopted until July, 2018, perhaps CPC has not adapted its procedures to new UDC requirements. If CPC is proceeding without written legal authority, kindly state that to be the case. If there is written legal authority, please provide.

Following is to state in more detail the basis of our objections. Right is reserved to add additional objections and arguments in event of any appeal.

The UDC language on the conduct of separately noticed, separately held public hearings on two distinct matters is plain and clear.

Section 5.29.6 covers Site Plans and applies to the proposed 2060 W.Stadium site plan. Its SubSection 5.29.6(C)(2) states: "The Planning Commission shall hold a public hearing." Section 5.29.6(D) indicates the subject of that public hearing. It details the criteria for site plan approval, including compliance with law, non-disturbance of disturbance of Natural Features, and non-detrimental effects. Note: all these criteria apply to site plan itself and only the site plan.

A separate section, Section 5.29.9, covers rezonings and applies to the requested rezoning of 2060 W. Stadium. Subsection 5.29.9(C)(1) states "The Planning Commission shall hold a public hearing pursuant to Section 5.28.3 on any proposed amendment to the zoning map." The subject of the public hearing is provided in Section 529.9 (A), which sets forth a strong presumption against rezonings and high standards for any rezoning

approval, including correction of past error, change in municipal policy, or changed conditions in the particular area of the City. These rezoning criteria relate to land use, and have nothing to do with a site plan. Indeed to be discussing these separate sets of criteria at the same time can only create confusion and awful decision making.

There is nothing in the UDC providing for these two separate public hearings to be combined and simultaneous or concurrently, except when wetland use is involved. Section 528.3(A)(1), the general section on public hearings, provides: "Prior to Planning Commission recommendation and City Council final action of any area plan, site plan, PUD site plan, rezoning, land division, or tentative or final preliminary plat, each body shall hold a public hearing. Prior to its final action on a site plan for Planning Commission approval, the Planning Commission shall hold a public hearing. Whenever a Wetland Use Permit is required under this chapter, the public hearing or hearings required in this subsection shall be held concurrently with the public hearing or hearings required by Section 5.29.4." (Emphasis added.)

Analogous provisions govern the public notice requirements for site plan and rezoning public hearings.

For due and fair regard to the rights and interests of its impacted citizens, the City Plan Commission must clarify and remedy the situation before conducting these public hearings. We would be pleased to discuss suggestions for such clarification and remedy.

Respectfully submitted,  
David Olmstead  
[reachdo@gmail.com](mailto:reachdo@gmail.com)  
734-476-5008

**From:** Rena Seltzer <[renaseltzer@gmail.com](mailto:renaseltzer@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 11, 2020 10:12 AM  
**To:** Planning <[Planning@a2gov.org](mailto:Planning@a2gov.org)>  
**Subject:** Development of 2060 W. Stadium Boulevard

11/10/20

Dear Ann Arbor City Planning Commission,

I am writing to oppose the development of a multi-story building and any zoning changes for 2060 W. Stadium Boulevard. This site backs up directly to our residential neighborhood, and the plan proposed by the developer would have a serious negative impact on those of us who would literally be living in the shadow of this plan. A four-story structure would be an eyesore and would block sunlight from the single-family homes that are directly to the east of the parcel. The current zoning that allows for parking up to the eastern edge of the property is a much better fit with the residential nature of the adjacent properties.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely, Rena Seltzer

Rena Seltzer  
6 Dover Court  
Ann Arbor, MI 48103  
(734) 223-3009

**From:** Amanda Wyse <[pelicanbreath@hotmail.com](mailto:pelicanbreath@hotmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Friday, November 13, 2020 2:58 PM  
**To:** Briggs, Erica <[EBriggs@a2gov.org](mailto:EBriggs@a2gov.org)>; Ramlawi, Ali <[ARamlawi@a2gov.org](mailto:ARamlawi@a2gov.org)>; ccheng@A2.gov; Planning <[Planning@a2gov.org](mailto:Planning@a2gov.org)>  
**Subject:** Public Hearing 2060 W. Stadium

Hi There,

I received a Notice Of Public Hearing about the NorthStadium, LLC redevelopment and rezoning of 2060 W. Stadium. My property is directly behind the land that the developer wants to rezone. I am writing to let you know that my husband and I and all of our neighbors oppose the rezoning of this land for the following reasons.

1. A portion of this site is zoned P (Parking Service) Classification to provide a buffer of space between the commercial businesses and the residential neighborhood and should not be re-zoned. The former owner of the commercial property dug out the berm separating the neighborhood from the commercial space to make the parking lot for his car dealership bigger and took out the buffer of trees already. Rezoning the lot now would open it up to future building even closer to our houses. The City of Ann Arbor's application asks how the rezoning will affect the public welfare and the property right of persons located in the vicinity: rezoning this land to C (Business Service) Classification will effect all of the people who have houses adjacent to the land. We will see and hear the activity from this building. We will see the lights, hear the people, hear the cars. The building will create a wall blocking the sky. It will affect the view of our back yard and tower over our houses in height to be seen from our front yards. It will effect our property values.

2. The developer wants to build a four story building which is inconsistent with all of the other buildings in the area. Page 98 of the Ann Arbor City Master Plan's Land Use Element states Goal D "To achieve a commercial district that is a physically attractive, cohesive shopping district with a unified visual impact that conveys a sense of place and provides a positive impression."

Nothing on Stadium that is adjacent to a neighborhood is taller than two stories. A four story building will look out of place, set precedent for other developments to build to supersize, block the sun, and cast security lights well over the tree line. A four story building will be so tall, it will be the first thing people see when they step out of Eberwhite Woods onto Ivywood Dr. This would not be physically attractive, it would not provide a unified visual impression. It would be ugly.

3. The developer's application says that the storage facility and bank will "attract the interest of the community members" and "create a stronger relationship between the businesses on the east side of Stadium and the residential neighborhoods to the east." But most people who use storage facilities do not walk there or ride their bike there. People must drive to a storage facility with a truck full of heavy stuff they need to put in storage. The developer also wants to build a bank with a drive through (not something pedestrians or bikers tend to use). Take a quick drive down Stadium and you'll see

there are already eight banks near 2060 Stadium. Instead, something should be built that the people in the neighboring community can really use. They can walk to a grocery store, post office or restaurant, but a supersized storage facility could be placed elsewhere in a more industrial location with other facilities that take up lots of space but do not benefit the community directly. On page 92 of the City's Land Use Element, it says that physical improvements to the Liberty/Stadium General Commercial District Subarea should "create a stronger relationship between businesses on the east side of Stadium Boulevard and the residential neighborhood to the east.

4. This proposed development does not address the A2Zero Carbon Neutrality Strategy. 2060 W. Stadium is not right off of an exit ramp of an expressway, people have to drive there with the things they need to put in storage. The whole idea of storage facilities encourages people to have more things than they need and can keep at their own house. The Developer's application says they will be more carbon neutral than the parking lot. In reality, people will be driving from a distance to the Storage Facility a storage facility can not "promote local transit" as the developer states in their application because people can not walk or bike with all of the boxes, furniture, cars and boats that they plan to put into the storage facility.

5. According to the Land Use Element (pg. 86) a current problem of West Stadium is that it has "no recognizable 'sense of place' causing travelers to be "bombarded with an excessive amount of information to process" and promoting "high accident rates due to an ugly hodge podge look". The four story bright orange storage facility will not fit into any cohesive theme architecturally with the surrounding buildings. The proposed development goes against the City Master Plan's goal of a having narrow focus of a neighborhood service area and instead contributes to a disconnected commercial image the city is trying to avoid.

Thank you for hearing these concerns. Please do not approve the application to rezone the lot from P to C. Please do not approve a four story building in that location. It is not consistent with the goals of the City Master Plan, does not meet the qualifications on the City's application, does not meet the needs of the community and certainly does not meet the A2Zero Carbon Neutrality Strategy. It is my understanding that the next step is a public hearing to be held by the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission on November 17 at 7:00 PM.

Amanda Wyse  
1937 Ivywood Dr.  
Ann Arbor 48103  
517-290-0111