

**From:** [ron@sovakemaus.name](mailto:ron@sovakemaus.name)  
**Sent:** Monday, November 15, 2021 9:34 AM  
**To:** Lenart, Brett <[BLenart@a2gov.org](mailto:BLenart@a2gov.org)>  
**Cc:** DiLeo, Alexis <[ADiLeo@a2gov.org](mailto:ADiLeo@a2gov.org)>; Gale, Mia <[RGale@a2gov.org](mailto:RGale@a2gov.org)>  
**Subject:** RE: TC1 zoning

Thanks Brett,

Another comment came to mind. I understand the ordinance doesn't address traffic design and I haven't looked at the city's transportation plan for this area. But the traffic design in the proposed district needs to be considered. I commuted down Eisenhower Pkwy south on State St then right on Ellsworth to Rancho Dr every day for seven years. The routes leading to the I94 interchanges are a race track for cars entering the I94 interchanges. If the TC1 aims to be commuter friendly, the roads need re-engineering to calm the traffic to accommodate other modes of transportation. The name "Transit Corridor" doesn't emphasize the goal of the ordinance "...pedestrian-friendly designs are critically important in this district as all transit users of any mode begin and end their trips as pedestrians." I tried to commute by bus through that corridor for an extended period. It was never a convenient, speedy, or pleasant way to commute from the east side of town. Briarwood is extremely unfriendly to pedestrians and other transport modes and I hope that gets addressed more directly in the separate treatment of the Briarwood site.

Regards,

Ron Emaus  
2503 Hampshire Rd  
Ann Arbor

**From:** Lenart, Brett <[BLenart@a2gov.org](mailto:BLenart@a2gov.org)>  
**Sent:** Friday, November 12, 2021 7:24 AM  
**To:** [ron@sovakemaus.name](mailto:ron@sovakemaus.name)  
**Cc:** DiLeo, Alexis <[ADiLeo@a2gov.org](mailto:ADiLeo@a2gov.org)>; Gale, Mia <[RGale@a2gov.org](mailto:RGale@a2gov.org)>  
**Subject:** RE: TC1 zoning

Thank you for your comments, they will be shared with the Planning Commission. From a Zoning perspective, no TIF mechanism is currently being considered, but it could be evaluated/considered in the future potentially.

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:** [ron@sovakemaus.name](mailto:ron@sovakemaus.name) <[ron@sovakemaus.name](mailto:ron@sovakemaus.name)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 10, 2021 5:58 PM  
**To:** Planning <[Planning@a2gov.org](mailto:Planning@a2gov.org)>  
**Cc:** Grand, Julie <[JGrand@a2gov.org](mailto:JGrand@a2gov.org)>; Radina, Travis <[TRadina@a2gov.org](mailto:TRadina@a2gov.org)>  
**Subject:** TC1 zoning

Kudos for envisioning dense development outside the downtown and lower town areas. Transit Oriented Corridors have been discussed in Planning and at the University for many years and I'm very supportive of the form-based plan I listened to last night providing the buffer to residential zoned areas is reduced as stated. As stated in the discussion, there is no rational or specific reason for the designated buffer requirements, just convention.

I was involved in rewriting the ordinances for the commercial districts more than a decade ago and developers stated they would not take advantage of the changes and they didn't. None of the commercial districts outside of downtown increased height/density, moved closer to the road with transparency, or added housing. Adding a few floors of lower revenue housing/office units did not offset the higher development cost. The incentives downtown did not lead to more affordable units. Developers simply paid the penalty. Given this experience, Going with by-right form-based rules without incentive formulas may entice development in that prime location and in other locations in the city along transit corridors. I hope it does. I hope the TC1 change motivates the reconfiguration of the I94/State interchange as presented in meetings several years ago.

I live near County Farm Park and when the property at Glenview and Washtenaw was for sale recently, I thought what a perfect place to put a 10 story or more mixed use building if it could be combined with the Arby's, gas station and other properties up to Whole Foods. I remember sitting in a meeting with Planning in the 90's discussing redevelopment of Washtenaw as a high density transit corridor. I discussed high-rises around the US23 and Washtenaw interchange with Jean Carlberg many years ago. Unlike South State, Washtenaw & Platt has many more amenities for residents: Food, Books, recreation, vets, dentists. When Arbor Hills was in the planning stages, we were trying to get that to include housing. It definitely turned out better than a strip mall but it did not accomplish our vision for the corridor. And since no one else in the outlying commercial districts even replicated this development, something else needs to be changed in the ordinance to motivate the changes. We also discussed a TIF be associated with Arbor Hills to start a fund to improve the Washtenaw corridor as a transit corridor.

Is there any thought of using a TIF to capture funds dedicated to the South State corridor to for example protect Malletts Creek and reconfigure the I94 interchange?

I can't wait for the TC1 to be adopted and see the response from developers. With Michigan being chosen as the best place on the Planet to live in 50 years, you can bet Ann Arbor will be the best place in Michigan. Let's throw off the segregationist and anti-development yoke of 50-70 year zoning rules in this town and start to envision a future is built around transit with zero carbon emissions.

Thank you for your presentation last night and for developing this new ordinance.

Ron Emaus  
2503 Hampshire Rd  
Ann Arbor MI 48104

[Ron@sovakemaus.name](mailto:Ron@sovakemaus.name)