City Planning Commission - This meeting will be broadcast live on CTN Cable Channel 16, ATT Channel 99, and online at a2gov.org/watchCTN

To speak at public comment call 206-337-9723 or 213-338-8477 or Toll Free 877-853-5247 or 888-788-0099 Enter Meeting

09-19-23 19:00

Agenda Name	Comments	Support	Oppose	Neutral
	1	0	0	0

Agenda Item: eComments for 9-c. 23-1543 1710 Dhu Varren Road - Village of Ann Arbor Amended Site Plan and Rezoning for City Council Approval - An amendment to the approved site plan that includes the rezoning of two parcels from Township to R4A (multiple-family residential) and 120 additional residential units along Dhu Varren with an amenities park area and adjacent parking. The total units proposed will be 604 units on the 78.5-acre site. The parcels to be rezoned are 2520 and 2540 Pontiac Trail. The total area of rezoning is 5.9 acres. Staff Recommendation: Approval

Mark Giuffrida

Location:

Submitted At: 10:40am 09-19-23

I fully expect the City Planning Commission to pass this regardless of any public comments being made. I challenge you to search your voting history where you voted in the best interest of the Ann Arbor residents and nature over more city tax revenue. Regardless of that, adding even more residents to this area is not in the best interests of the residents anywhere in A2. First, street infrastructure (i.e., 1 lane road, no roundabouts) etc cannot handle it - it already cannot handle the growth you've allowed - also water, electricity needs. Infrastructure needs to be built first, then this can be considered. Also A2 says it wants to support sustainability, bee pollinators, nature, then it shouldn't be developing untouched land in the city. That land should remain green -David Attenborough stresses the importance of this. Very hypocritical to preserve farm land outside the city, but not within the city. Only allow redevelopment of improved land, not untouched land!

From: Jon Carlson < <u>ion@2mission.com</u>>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2023 7:41 AM

To: Disch, Lisa < LDisch@a2gov.org> Subject: 100 block South Main

Lisa

My name is Jon Carlson and I am the owner of the 111 South Main building . I just wanted to quickly say that I'm in favor of some form of the redevelopment on the Chase Building. I'm confident in the City to work through the process and achieve the best project for our community . While the developers appear to not be from Ann Arbor it looks like an excellent development with increased density.

That said, our building is mid block and my tenants use the back entrance for deliveries, emergency egress and honestly as back entrance as it's adjacent to the parking garage. We are not in favor of losing this public alley. It would be severely damaging to the use of our building.

Take Care,

Jon A. Carlson

From: James D'Amour < <u>jamescarldamour@gmail.com</u>>

Sent: Monday, September 18, 2023 4:53 PM

To: Planning < Planning@a2gov.org>

Subject: Robertson Phase II proposal, CPC, Tues. Sept. 19, 2023

Prior commitments prevent me from attending or addressing the Tuesday. Sept. 19 CPC meeting so I wished to share my remarks regarding agenda item 9-c

As you are considering Phase II of the proposal, I note that this will include 120 gas-heated apartments.

These gas furnaces go directly against the A2ZERO plan, This is simply unacceptable for new construction at this stage of the climate crisis. How this commission responds is in my view a key test of this commission's resolve to address climate and sustainability goals.

High efficiency air source heat pumps should be used.

Let's see where you are on this.

Please modify this plan to mandate an all-electric new community, if you are serious about sustainability.

Respectfully,

-James

James D'Amour Member, City Planning Commission City of Ann Arbor July 2003, September 2006 From: Robert Fagerlund < robert fager@yahoo.com>

Sent: Monday, September 11, 2023 9:15 PM

To: Planning < Planning@a2gov.org>

Subject: 24-story skyscraper proposed on Ann Arbor's Main Street

Planning Commission

I am unalterably opposed to the 24 story skyscraper proposed on Main Street in Ann Arbor.

Please do not let this go forward. It would be a very negative element to downtown Ann Arbor.

Thank you.

Robert J. Fagerlund Ann Arbor Resident. From: KEN GARBER < kengarber@prodigy.net > Sent: Wednesday, September 13, 2023 8:47 AM

To: Planning < Planning@a2gov.org >

Subject: carbon pollution impact fee proposal

To the Planning Commission:

The following resolution was considered by Energy Commission at its September 12 meeting. Because it's a modification to the UDC, it may be of interest to Planning Commission.

Ken Garber

Resolution Recommending a Carbon Impact User Fee for New Construction

WHEREAS, in November 2019, Ann Arbor City Council unanimously adopted a Climate Emergency Declaration committing to a path to carbon neutrality by the year 2030;

WHEREAS, in June 2020, City Council unanimously adopted the A2ZERO Carbon Neutrality Plan, a document that lays out seven strategies for our community to achieve carbon neutrality;

WHEREAS, buildings account for 65% of Ann Arbor's total emissions, with fossil gas combustion accounting for roughly half that amount;

WHEREAS, Strategy 2, Action 1 of the A2ZERO plan includes the following assumption: "All new residential and commercial buildings are designed and built to operate without the use of natural gas, reducing the increased cost associated with retrofitting existing systems."

WHEREAS, Strategy 3, action 2 of the A2ZERO plan includes the following assumption: "All new construction from 2022 through 2030 (and beyond) is built to net zero energy standards, which includes no natural gas consumption and all electricity usage offset through the CCA";

WHEREAS, since A2ZERO plan adoption and despite the plan's stated strategies, the city has approved 25 separate development projects using gas heating, totaling 2,063,343 square feet;

WHEREAS, these buildings, collectively, when complete, will emit from fossil gas combustion approximately 17,663 metric tons CO2e emissions annually for their useful life, or will require retrofitting at substantial expense;

WHEREAS, these emissions will, on an annual basis, cancel out the combined emissions averted through the city's Solarize program to date and the planned Solar at City Facilities and parks solar projects by more than a factor of two;

WHEREAS, there exist no statutory or administrative restrictions on new construction in Ann Arbor using fossil gas infrastructure, and such buildings continue to be proposed and to receive city approval on a regular basis;

WHEREAS, greenhouse gas emissions from these buildings are not in any way factored into construction costs, with the atmosphere serving as an unregulated open sewer for these emissions:

WHEREAS, those costs, in the form of loss of income, well-being, and human life, and mass forced migration, are instead borne by those most impacted by the effects of global heating, predominantly low income individuals and residents of the global South;

WHEREAS, the 2021 IECC Zero Code Appendix sets out standardized energy use intensity (EUI) estimates for various building types according to climate zone;

WHEREAS, a conversion factor of 13kg CO2e per therm (100 kBtu) from fossil gas combustion is recommended by NASA climate scientist Peter Kalmus, taking into account upstream losses from gas extraction, flaring and leakage as well as direct emissions from combustion;

WHEREAS, the EPA has proposed a social cost of carbon of \$190 per ton, taking into account recent scientific and methodological advances in estimating the collective societal burden of emissions;

RESOLVED, that the Ann Arbor Energy Commission recommends that City Council approve, by ordinance, modification of City Code chapter 55, article V, Administrative Bodies and Procedures, by adding the following subsection to section 5.28.1D (Fees):

The following fees are authorized by this chapter and shall be by resolution of the City Council upon the recommendation of the City Administrator.

... ...

5. Carbon Pollution Impact Fee

A fee reflecting the social cost of carbon shall be assessed for all newly approved buildings with a connection to natural gas lines that serve the building's primary heating system.

- 1. The fee shall be assessed based on total building square footage according to building type energy use, as specified by table CC103.1 of the 2021 International Energy Conservation Code Zero Code Appendix.
- 2. A conversion factor of 13kg CO2e (CO2 equivalents) per 100 kBtu shall be applied.
- 3. The fee shall be in the amount of \$190 per metric ton CO2e.
- 4. The fee shall be paid prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, then each subsequent year on or before that date, in the absence of retrofitting to eliminate the gas connection for primary heating purposes.

From: David Gurk <dgurk@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 1:43 AM

To: Planning < Planning@a2gov.org > Subject: The Village of Ann Arbor

Dear Commissioners,

I understand that Phase 2 of The Village of Ann Arbor is up for approval at the present time. I also understand that Phase 1 was approved with gas furnaces for heating in the main building, though many of us objected to it.

I sent a number of letters myself last year. One of my main arguments was that it is far easier to have electric heat pumps in a new building because they would be designed into the plan. It is far more difficult to retrofit an older building to accommodate heat pumps because they would not be designed to do so. When I made that argument last year, it was a hypothetical argument. Now I make that same point again and it is no longer hypothetical. It is empirical reality. I live in an older condominium complex where all the HVAC equipment is housed in outdoor utility closets. My 25-year-old furnace died last December. I wanted to get a heat pump to replace it, but to make a long story short, I could not get a heat pump which would function properly from inside my utility closet. I had to have a new gas furnace installed. It broke my heart, but I had no choice.

I hope the point of this story is clear. If you approve this building with gas furnaces, not only will it start off burning gas for heat, it may be stuck with gas heating for its lifetime. Transitioning off gas in the future may be impossible. Think of the impact of that.

Please try to find a way to compel the developers to use electric heat pumps for the entirety of the Phase 2 project. The planet is burning, and we must work at all levels to eliminate the continued burning of fossil fuels. We can't put the transition off until sometime in the future, especially when, as my story illustrated, retrofitting an old building may be a pipe dream.

Thank you, David Gurk Ann Arbor, MI From: paul jensen < beadoz@yahoo.co.uk > Sent: Tuesday, September 12, 2023 11:21 AM

To: Kelley, Hank < HKelley@a2gov.org>

Subject: Re: HELP

GENERAL ,THANK YOU . WHAT CAUGHT MY EYE YESTERDAY WAS THE OLD CHASE BUILDING WHICH WOULD BE WAY OUT OF PROPORTION

PAUL JENSEN

On Tuesday, 12 September 2023 at 10:31:54 GMT-4, Kelley, Hank < hkelley@a2gov.org > wrote:

Hello Paul Jensen,

Would you like this comment to be shared with the Planning Commission, and if so could you tell me if it is in reference to a specific project or just general public comment on development in the city?

Thank you,

Hank Kelley, AICP (they/them)

Deputy Planning Manager
City of Ann Arbor Planning Services
301 E. Huron Street, P.O. Box 8647
Ann Arbor, MI 48107-8647

hkelley@a2gov.org | Direct (734) 794-6000 #42605 | General (734) 794-6265 | www.a2gov.org

From: paul jensen < beadoz@yahoo.co.uk > Sent: Tuesday, September 12, 2023 9:11 AM To: Kelley, Hank < HKelley@a2gov.org >

Subject: HELP

AVOID GENTRIFICATION AND BUILDING ABOVE 11 STORIES DOWNTOWN ,PROVIDE AFFORDABLE HOUSING THANKS
PAUL JENSEN

From: Daniel Rosenbaum < drosenbaum28@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 13, 2023 11:47 AM

To: Planning < Planning@a2gov.org>

Subject: Support for Development at 125 South Main

Good morning,

I wanted to share a quick note of support for the proposed development on this property. As a nearby homeowner and resident, I see firsthand how downtown Ann Arbor continues to struggle to recover from the pandemic. Bringing more people downtown will help businesses, reduce crime, and make central Ann Arbor a more vibrant and sustainable place. Increasing density at a prime intersection is far better than building a new subdivision on the outskirts of town.

For these reasons, I support the proposed concept and welcome a tall building at this intersection -- and at any other underutilized intersection downtown.

Thank you,

Daniel Rosenbaum 847-624-2243 From: Kirk Westphal < writetokirk@gmail.com > Sent: Monday, September 18, 2023 5:19 PM

To: Planning < Planning@a2gov.org >

Subject: premiums and Green Rd PUD sidewalk

Greetings Commissioners,

- 1. I want to voice support for eliminating downtown premiums.
- 2. I'm mostly supportive of item 9-b, making the ERIM PUD taller and inclusive of residential, however I would like you to consider <u>amending the PUD language with regard to the west border of the site because of the potential impact on the heavily-used sidewalk</u>.

Specifically:

- <u>Please do not allow more curb cuts on this site</u>. More curb cuts would endanger the hundreds of pedestrians and cyclists who use this sidewalk on a daily basis, many of whom are moderate- to low-income renters and their young children (who live in Green Brier apartments or the Green-Baxter Housing Commission property). For many, this sidewalk is their primary means to access groceries at Busch's—I see this wonderful foot traffic all the time, as I live 3/4 mile south of the site and use it myself. The city espouses "consolidation of curb cuts" in our plans, and these properties are already serviced by a large internal boulevard/driveway.
- Please consider protecting the substantial tree line along the west sidewalk on Green Road. I'm attaching a street view of of this block, as I don't see a good representation in the packet. These trees provide shade to the users of the sidewalk. I understand that there is a minimum 15' setback, but this would be insufficient to protect the trees or their root zones. If a building is proposed to come up to the 15' setback line, and removing these trees "buys" the developer more residential units, that's fine. But I'm afraid that these trees will simply be removed out of convenience, and then a strip-mall-style parking lot will get installed between the sidewalk and buildings. Perhaps make the setback 20-25'? (If a natural features "alternatives analysis" is already required in the petition phase, I suppose this might be unnecessary, but it would be helpful to proactively protect these trees in the PUD language.) Which brings me to:
- <u>Please consider requiring 60%+ building frontage on Green Road and prohibition of street-facing parking</u>. This would be more consistent with the existing standards for nearby commercial zoning and future nearby TC1 standards. Please don't allow the unpleasant, unwalkable, and obsolete model of pedestrian-facing parking to be built here. I'm guessing that a lot of the site will ultimately be surface parking; we don't need it facing the street.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely, Kirk Westphal

