

From: David Olmstead <reachdo@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 6:36 PM
To: Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>
Cc: Lenart, Brett <BLenart@a2gov.org>; Cheng, Christopher <CCheng@a2gov.org>; Kurt Gardner <dudemacaroni@yahoo.com>; Sue Perry <sueperry@comcast.net>
Subject: Proposed Northstar Project 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.

Planning Commission:

Because we residents can not personally attend the public hearings and organize an orderly presentation, Director Lenart is endeavoring for our calls to begin with David Olmstead, 734-476-5008, Sue Perry, 734-662-3321, and Kurt Gardner, 248-719-0630.

Because I am having problems attaching my document (which I will send later) following are the statements of David Olmstead and Sue Perry, and if there are time constraints, Kurt Gardner.

Statements of David Olmstead, 600 Ridgewood Court,
and Sue Perry, 1708 Fair St.

To

Ann Arbor City Planning Commission
Public Hearings : 2060 West Stadium Proposed Development
November 17, 2020

Good Evening Commissioners

We future Northstar neighbors appreciate the need to redevelop the dormant Naylor site and realize that

Northstar's public storage facility suits that need. We will be cooperative and constructive. We have two requests.

- 1.
2. That the Commission weigh the interests of Northstar and
3. the interests of residents equally, and
- 4.
- 5.
6. That Northstar provide actual answers to legitimate resident
7. questions raised from the beginning of the project process.
- 8.

The lots along this section of Stadium Blvd. are unusually zoned. They have bifurcated zoning. The lots are zoned C2B in front and a narrow strip in the rear is zoned Parking. The fact that this original and long-standing zoning is unusual does not make it suspect. Instead it warrants careful attention to why this unusual provision was there in first place. The purpose had to be more than simply assuring adequate parking.

The staff report recognizes the unique purpose of this separate zoning for parking.

Staff states: "Historically, P zoning was used as a buffer from commercial uses adjacent to residential uses."

An extended buffer zone to insulate residents from actual operations is absolutely essential here. Storage operations

mean truck and trailer traffic and moving noises and lights, 6:30 am to 9 pm, every day, 7 days a week. Instead Northstar wants rezoning so it can move its building and operations [40-50 ft ?] closer to residents.

Northstar insists that its project must be allowed if it meets current UDC requirements. Fair enough, but just as Northstar wants to rely upon existing standards, so too must residents be able to rely upon long-standing zoning that was specifically intended to protect their interests.

Nonetheless, staff gives greater weight to Northstar's interests. Staff says:

"The Master Plan, Land Use Element recommends commercial uses for this site."

And thus,

"Staff recommends that the zoning be approved because the proposed uses permitted under the C2B zoning district are consistent with the recommendations of the Master Plan."

Staff's reference to the Master Plan is extremely misleading. There is nothing in the Master Plan which recommends that parking zones be eliminated or that parking zones be rezoned commercial.

Here is what the Master Plan, in summary, actually recommends: (1) minimizing the amount of unnecessary parking spaces; (2) designing parking lots to be

less aggravating; and (3) requiring that surface parking be placed at the rear of buildings.

Now let's compare staff's standard for rezoning, that being "consistent with the recommendations of the Master Plan" with what the law requires. Compare the staff recommended standard for rezoning with its recommendation for site plan approval. For site plan approval staff carefully recites the specific criteria of UDC Section 5.29.6 (D) for site plan approval, namely:

- 1.
2. compliance with all laws and regulations; (2) non-disturbance
3. of natural features; and (3) not cause a public or private nuisance and ... not have a detrimental effect on public health, safety or welfare."
- 4.

Like its specific criteria for site plan approval, the UDC likewise has specific criteria for rezonings. Section 5.29.9 provides: " For the purpose of establishing and maintaining sound, stable and desirable development within the territorial limits of the City, the boundaries of any zoning district shall not be amended except, and here in summary are the three criteria: (1) to correct an error, (2) because of change in municipal policy, or (3) because of changed conditions of the area.

The staff recommendation for rezoning does not recognize or address any of the required UDC criteria. The staff recommendation for rezoning is legally defective on its face.

At the same time, Northstar's answers to rezoning application questions are vague or exaggerated.

Instead of saying there will be two jobs in the storage facility, Northstar exaggerates: "The rezoning allows for the development of a business that provides employment opportunity and helps to stimulate the local economy."

With rezoning, Northstar's application states that with rezoning "Noise/ light pollution are potentially reduced"; "views from the homes to the east will be largely unaffected"; and the the rezoning "[will] help to create a stronger relationship between the businesses on the east side of Stadium Blvd. and the residential neighborhoods to the east."

Look carefully at that rezoning application: every advantage promised in the application will be accomplished without the rezoning, just by reducing a 120,000 sq ft building by 10,000 sq ft.

Compare Northstar's exaggerations and assertions without evidence in its rezoning application to Northstar's actual replies to the questions of near-by residents at the Citizen Participation Meeting There were questions about noise, sun blockage, night light pollution, trash being discarded when storage renters --all problems that will be

severely aggravated by moving the storage structure 20 to 25 [?] feet closer to the residents by rezoning.

Here are the invariable Northstar replies:

“We are further refining our plans and will incorporate community comments from the meeting to revise our current site layout as appropriate.” Appropriate to whom?

“We are working with our engineers currently to addressnoise emissions.We anticipate little noise to the surrounding uses. ”

“We are working with our architects to provide us with sun study exercises that will allow us to better answer this topic.”

“We are still in the preliminary design phase with regards to lighting. We will work together with neighboring property owners to ensure needs are being met.”

Northstar promised to get back to residents with answers to their question, In their meeting report Northstar lists the email address for each questioner. But there has never been any answers to these questions by Northstar.

Staff’s response to this Northstar evasiveness, is a trusting “be careful.” For example in its August 12 letter staff says: “Please ensure all lighting does not cause a nuisance with the adjacent neighborhood. ”

Unlike staff, we neighbors have no comfort or satisfaction, for our lives and homes in coming years" by Northstar's exaggerations and assertions without evidence.

Northstar has not answered our questions. We will have to find out the answers ourselves. Indeed staff and this Commission should want answers to these same questions. There is a way for all of us to get those answers.

Planning staff requested Northstar to "consider reducing the floor area of either the office building or the storage facility to meet " [parking standards].

Northstar refused Staff's request: In it's Sept 11 reply letter Northstar wrote

"Our refusal] is predicated on

Applicant's knowledge from other self-storage facilities. Similar size storage buildings owned by this developer have only required approximately 12-15 parking spaces to adequately serve the building."

In effect Northstar is telling its neighbors, the Planning Commission and staff that based on Northstar's experience with "similar size storage buildings," it knows how to avoid all of the problems and concerns raised by neighbors and staff.

So let's go with that: Northstar, tell us where those similar size buildings are. Let us confirm for ourselves that you have avoided the noise, trash, light pollution, and parking problems that can arise from a 120,000 sq ft storage facility.

Commissioners: A 120,000 sq ft storage facility will be among the largest in America. You owe it to the City to make sure it is not an embarrassment and full scale nuisance. Give staff and residents an opportunity to see how Northstar's 120,000 sq ft storage facilities have worked out in other communities. Require Northstar to name and locate its similar size storage facilities so that the Commission, staff and we future Northstar neighbors can get the answers we all need.

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ David Olmstead
/s/ Sue Perry