

**From:** [maaisha@aol.com](mailto:maaisha@aol.com) [<mailto:maaisha@aol.com>]

**Sent:** Saturday, March 31, 2012 5:49 PM

**To:** Cheng, Christopher

**Subject:** Chalmers wooded residential lot plan

Dear Mr. Cheng,

Thank you for taking the time to listen to my concerns about the proposed change of zoning to allow commercial parking at the residential lot next door to my daughter's house at 2084 Chalmers Drive. The parking lot also affects me since I live on the other side of my daughter, at 2070 Chalmers Dr.

Mr. Len Nadolski owns the property in question, along with the Chalmers Place shopping center. He also owned the previous business, in partnership with John Cueter, an auto dealership. They put a great deal of planning into the new shopping center, and planned on the ratio of stores to parking spaces that they now have.

Mr. Nadolski and his employees held a neighborhood meeting to discuss his plans for the parking lot. Just as with the shopping center, it seemed that a great deal of thought had been put into the plan. They had thought about shielding the view from the street and had designed a little pond to collect run off after rains. They said they are having trouble renting their stores because they don't have enough parking.

I walk my dog through the center each morning and some lunch times as well as occasional evenings. I have never seen the parking lot full. Quite a few of the cars belong to Jimmy Johns drivers and are in and out constantly (with great speed). I believe there are more important factors involved in renting those store spaces, such as the economy, the required five year lease, and other requirements they impose on their lessees. But regardless, I feel this is not a problem that needs to be resolved by creating a negative impact on the neighbors.

We have had many problems with the people who park in the spaces behind the stores, abutting the wooded residential property in question. There is often loud music, loud laughter, talking, and seemingly drinking, and sometimes loud arguments. I have come over there in the early morning to ask that radios be turned down, only to find the driver getting dressed and shaving. He would not turn the music down, but did agree to shut the car door in order to muffle it. One day a very disoriented homeless man had to be tackled by the police when he was walking up and down the back parking area, yelling insensibly and waving a gun. The area of the woods closest to Mallet's Creek is used by the homeless to get to camping areas back there. The collision shop had to construct a fence after violating zoning by parking on the residential lot (after plowing down the work of master gardener Ursula Sell). The fence was soon knocked down and is flat today. Mr. Nadolski has a gate in the fence which is also often left open by homeless campers. The parking lot they already have is troublesome enough. We really do not want it expanded. When we bought the house from Mr. Nadolski we knew the lot next door was residential, and felt secure that no commercial ugliness would be built next to us.

Mr. Nadolski's planners came up with a design that looked pleasant at first. The wooded lot is at least one story below the level of the present parking lot, and also one level below my daughter's house. They propose that trees would shield my daughter's view, and return her some privacy, but these trees would have to be about 50 or 60 feet high to offer any screening to my daughter's house.. I don't think they took into account the height of her house. And, as I mentioned at the meeting, my grandchildren's bedrooms are at that end of the house, overlooking the woods right now. Creating a secluded parking lot which would be attractive to the same party and homeless people now frequenting it, would put my grandchildren on view and accessible to these people. It would also spoil the lovely residential view they have now.

I am aware that Mr. Nadolski has been anxious to get the property zoned commercial ever since he bought it. He may have assumed that he could do that. This is not his first effort. However, we bought the house knowing that lot was zoned residential, and were prepared to see a house go in there. In fact, my daughter's in-laws wanted to buy the lot and build there, but Mr. Nadolski refused, saying he had other plans for the property. At the meeting we were told worse things could happen to the lot, such as a day care coming in. We would be much happier with a day care than with sketchy people hanging out looking into our backyard and the children's bedrooms..

It should also be pointed out that this property borders Mallet's Creek, and would mean a huge increase in impervious surface next to the creek, which is now undergoing restoration work. The razed garden

formerly used for parking by Collex Collision (and previously offered to them by Mr. Nadolski) already created a large impervious surface by compacting the ground for parking the crashed cars they work on.

I feel it would be a disservice to our neighborhood to allow the proposed parking lot. It has definite residential potential, and its zoning was known at the time of the original shopping center planning. A parking lot would lower the value (and tax base) of my daughter's property, as well as infringe on their privacy and the safety of my grandchildren. It would create a very large impervious surface next to Mallet's Creek and become an attractive nuisance bringing in more negative activity, affecting the neighborhood's quality of life. I would like to ask that this proposal be rejected.

Sincerely,  
Lois Kamoi  
2070 Chalmers Dr.  
Ann Arbor, MI 48104  
(734) 272-1372  
[maaisha@aol.com](mailto:maaisha@aol.com)