

Kowalski, Matthew

From: Ken Timmer [ktimmer@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:33 PM
To: Kowalski, Matthew
Cc: Planning; CityCouncil; Ruth Dixon
Subject: Re: 2250 Ann Arbor-Saline Rd development

My wife and I are out of town and unable to attend the Planning Commission meeting on Aug 3.

The neighborhood appreciates the commission action to withhold approval of the project until any vehicle access to Lambeth was removed. This was a major issue and having this removed totally was the right thing to do. That being said there are still issues with the proposal.

First, as Ruth Dixon states, it is too large and does not fit in with the existing neighborhood. Brad Moore told us at the public meeting last week that the number of units (75) was determined by the formula that allows 15 units per acre. Since the property is 5 acres, they went to the maximum of 75 units. However, it was also discussed that a large portion of the property is being purchased by the city as an "easement" for the retention pond, that the city is actually paying a significant portion of its construction, and that the city will maintain the retention pond. Therefore, since this portion of the property is more "city" than development, what would the number of permitted units be if this portion of the property were removed from the calculation? If the retention pond is about one acre, the four remaining acres would permit only 60 units, rather than 75. This might result in the building being only 2 stories high, rather than three. A reduction in the size and height of the building to be more appropriate for the surrounding area. I would request the Planning Commission and Council consider this.

Second, it is absolutely mandatory that NO construction traffic be allowed to use Lambeth as an access. Brad Moore agreed that this would not be done, but this must be part of the site plan approval.

Third, there must be an effort to save as many trees as possible, especially those that form a buffer between the development and the residential area of Lansdowne. Again, Brad Moore agreed to a plan to ensure this would happen (note in a separate email), but this also needs to be part of the site plan approval to enforce that it happen.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ken Timmer
2112 Ascot Rd

Sent from my iPad

On Jul 29, 2016, at 5:41 PM, Ruth Dixon <radixon@umich.edu> wrote:

The neighborhood and the Planning Commission are now getting ready for another discussion on 2250 Ann Arbor-Saline Rd and the multiple meetings makes it clear that there are several issues that concern both the Commission and the neighborhood. In short, the proposed development is:

- too big,
- too close to existing structures,

- strips the land of almost all trees and all of the understory growth that provides water retention and a sound barrier,
- adds to a storm sewer system that was historically called over-capacity.

All of these issues have been detailed before in the emails you have received from the neighborhood and yet the Planning Commission has not been forceful enough in their directions to the landowner and has already released this proposal to the city council.

(note-We are only back at the Planning Commission because of a procedural matter involving community notification.)

I have been trying to understand the Planning Commission's actions and can only think it has something to do with the use of some of the 2250 low land area as an extra large detention pond. The need for this large detention pond was created by poorly designed, poorly inspected and poorly maintained detention ponds for the current developments off Scio Church Rd north of this site.

I appreciate the need to help mitigate the flooding to the south of 2250 but I am concerned that this proposal is not the best solution. Currently, the developer retains ownership to the land and is allowed to build a larger structure even though the city pays an undisclosed sum to the developer for the privilege of using this unbuildable land. In addition to this undisclosed cost, the city is also responsible for building and maintaining the pond. The details of this agreement have not been made public. This cost information and the increase in building size due to this agreement needs to be distributed to the public before any final decision is made.

We need to know the answers to three questions:

- 1)What are we paying?
- 2)How much bigger is the development due to this deal?
- 3)Did the city negotiate a reasonable deal for use of the unbuildable portion of the property?

.

--

Ruth A Dixon