

**Lenart, Brett**

---

**From:** Rosemary Bogdan <rosemarybogdan@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 19, 2018 12:33 PM  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Thank you for Listening

Dear Planning Commission,

Thank you for listening last night to the many concerns expressed by the residents of Forestbrooke regarding the requested rezoning for Brightdawn development.

One item that we all feel very strongly about is the danger to our children from the inevitable and dramatic increase in traffic from this development. We share this concern with or without opening Burton into Eli.

Would any members of your commission be willing to come to Forestbrooke to meet with some of us, visit the Brightdawn site and take a drive-through from the site to the Washtenaw/US23 interchange? I think seeing the site would give you all a much better idea of its drawbacks, and a quick drive-through would show you exactly why we are quite certain that hundreds of cars daily would be funneled into our quiet family neighborhood endangering our children as they walk to school and swim practice.

Such a visit could be scheduled in the new year and entirely at your convenience.

Again, thank you for hearing our concerns. Have a wonderful holiday.

Rosemary Bogdan  
3550 Terhune Rd.  
734-646-2243

**Lenart, Brett**

---

**From:** Angie Smith <smitha8014@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 19, 2018 5:17 PM  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning commission meeting follow up

Dear Planning Commissioners,

Thank you so much for allowing us your attention and time to discuss the Brightdawn apartment proposal with you. I realize that my letter never made it to your desk yesterday, and I am attaching it below with my apologies.

A few thoughts/requests that I have after the meeting closed:

- the proposal was postponed, so what's next? How will planning commission decide how and when to bring this forward?

(There was talk of another community neighborhood to try to work things out. But I feel that the developers goals are profitability and the community's goals are different, so I'm not sure how we can come to further agreement without involvement from Planning.)

- it sounds like commissioners are hoping for 2 big issues to be resolved:

1) It sounds like there's considerable support from commission for the project to require at least 40 units at 60%AMI. I think the neighborhood supports this too, as long as the density is not such that it makes the current neighborhood and roadways clogged, more congested and unsafe. The land was bought knowing there were caps and restrictions on height and density. Please don't trade more units for a mediocre plan that does not feel desirable to potential tenants.

2) Some commissioners are interested in the opening of Eli to allow for connectivity and better traffic patterns. The current traffic study truly does not examine the impact that 160 units could have on safe neighborhood traffic. On behalf of the Forestbrooke Neighborhood I'd like to request that the impact be carefully studied before approving that.

Thank you again for your attention and dialogue on this matter. It truly will impact our daily lives and we appreciate your interest in our understanding and experiences.

-angie smith

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I wanted to share my thoughts on the proposed Brightdawn apartment, as you consider the revisions that the developers are requesting. I notice that the city planners are recommending that you do NOT approve a change to the zoning, and speaking on behalf of the Forestbrooke neighborhood, we ask the same.

I am an advocate for affordable housing in Ann Arbor; the benefits are clear, and it is important for the city to set goals and plans to encourage it. But this plan offers inadequate outcomes for the compromises that it is asking the city to make.

My involvement and experience as a neighbor make me concerned for the sustainability of this project. The city has already redefined the area in order to support an affordable housing scenario. In fact the 120 density that is already approved seems to high to be supported with out grave impact on the traffic and environmental systems in the community.

Ten our so years ago the plot of land was occupied by 8 houses and a wooded wetland that was home to families, wildlife, trees, and trails. Since then a developer bought out the homes in an attempt to build affordable housing just inside the city limits. High density apartment plans that featured local and federal tax breaks for affordable housing, a rezoning to make the development more profitable, and a promise to not allow traffic a cut-through at Eli Rd were dropped after the project was deemed unviable. The land attracted homeless camps and illegal dumping, and neighbors have been in contact with the city to keep those issues under control while the previous owners did nothing to manage it.

Now that the land has been sold to a new developer, the city is being asked to bump up the zoning once again in the interest of profitability, and compromise the existing neighborhood, traffic patterns, and remaining natural features.

The new plan requests 4 stories of living space to further increase capacity. It relies on an outdated traffic study that mentions both an opening and non-opening of Eli Rd as a cut through for cars that are highway bound or heading into Ann Arbor.

The developer calls their clientele 'workforce' tenants who would likely be driving by car to the city's hospitals, schools, restaurants, and shops. A change in zoning allows a capacity of 640 tenants, which would most certainly have a dramatic impact on the surrounding neighborhood schools, community pool, safety of the streets and roadways. Traffic concerns extend down Washtenaw Avenue (which is severely over trafficked at regular work commute times) and onto Packard (where it would be hard to imagine residents ever being able to complete a left-hand turn at certain times of day).

Many questions of traffic safety were never answered the first time this project was rezoned. Making plans to open Eli Rd as a through street or allowing another increase in capacity adds many additional threats to traffic safety that will need to be reconsidered.

Affordable Housing is a critical goal for Ann Arbor, but making compromises to gain more affordable units in the city limits will not work unless they fit the people who need them. In this neighborhood of Ann Arbor, there are already many affordable homes to choose from. Nearby apartments have vacancies (that are not listed on Zillow), Pittsfield Village offers available lease or buy options that remain among the most affordable in the city.

The developers are asking us to trust this project. But at their feedback meeting for current neighbors of the development they wooed the community by promising that they would offer additional Burton Rd. parking spaces as an amenity to the community. This shows no investment in community. They are promising little to no investment in the area parks, schools, open spaces, gardens, community pool. There are little to no plans to safeguard the wetlands, or in mitigating the risk the development would be to noise, air, and ground pollution, already of concern in the area. On top of that, they disclosed their interest in selling the property off in 10 years. The amenities that they offer to their residents look good on paper. For example wheel chair accessible parking and entries sound great, but who are these wheeled residents that are being asked get to a bus stop over ¼ mile away for the #5 bus – further for the Washtenaw Rd bus stops. If they have vehicles, more parking is surely needed, if they do not, they will want to be closer to a true transportation corridor, not tucked back on a small street that will not have bus access.

Many questions have been raised by staff and community members. We are depending on you to work with the developers to create a project that satisfies their need for profitability with the city's goals of affordable housing, all without compromising in a way that is unsafe and unfair to the current community. Thank you for considering these and other concerns about how this proposal will impact the city. We respectfully urge you to vote no in the rezoning of this parcel.

~angie smith

2803 lillian

Ann arbor MI

**Lenart, Brett**

---

**From:** Gloria Jones <gloria.kathleen.jones@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 20, 2018 2:48 PM  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** BurtonCommons/Bright Dawn/Glory Crest Development

Hi Commissioners,

Thank you for hearing the concerns of your citizens last Tuesday evening. We recognize how long the meeting extended and value your work. This was the first planning meeting that I have attended personally. It was valuable experience. We look forward to working with you as this process continues in the new year.

Sincerely,

--

Gloria K Jones  
Family Enthusiast | Lover of All Things Handmade  
[gloria.kathleen.jones@gmail.com](mailto:gloria.kathleen.jones@gmail.com)  
586.907.6512 cell

**Lenart, Brett**

---

**From:** Marianne Lembfeld <mariannelembfeld@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 20, 2018 3:18 PM  
**To:** Planning  
**Cc:** Taylor, Christopher (Mayor)  
**Subject:** 2805 Burton Rd. Construction Plan

Good afternoon,

I hear that four-story buildings are supposed to be built in that street. At this time, there is a forest that is home to deer, birds and numerous other wildlife and in the summer to homeless people. I think the nature area should stay. It is very close to the freeway and thus undesirable and even dangerous for people to live there.

Thank you.

Marianne Lembfeld  
**Ward 3**  
**Voting Citizen**  
734-972-3428

**Lenart, Brett**

---

**From:** Simone Samano <si\_samano@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 31, 2018 9:00 AM  
**To:** Planning  
**Cc:** Julie Grand; Ackerman, Zach; Andy LaBarre; Lenart, Brett; Cheng, Christopher  
**Subject:** Highest Subsidized Lunch in Burton Project Area

Dear Planning Commission and Staff,

This chart is further evidence that our South East area already serves the highest number of struggling families while most other areas serve significantly less. To put more affordable housing in our area will overburden our schools and negate our current economic diversity - not to mention all the traffic, safety, and other concerns detailed by my neighbors in the December meeting.

**It violates everything we know about maintaining healthy cities to purposely locate lower income all in one area.** The developer is going to profit off of your desire to have more affordable housing in Ann Arbor at the expense of a neighborhood that is already living the values the city espouses but gets no respect for it.

See my previous remarks below and consider the negative effect this dense, inappropriate development will have on our area and our city. Look closely at the numbers and consider what they really mean for our neighborhood, then listen those of us who live here!

Respectfully,  
Simone McDaniel

**FREE AND REDUCED LUNCH BY AAPS SCHOOL (sorted highest to lowest)**

<b>Building</b>	<b>Fall 2016 student count</b>	<b>% subsidized lunch</b>
Pathways To Success Academic Campus	155	62%
Mary D. Mitchell School	363	60%
Scarlett Middle School	577	52%
Pittsfield School	254	50%
Carpenter School	434	41%
Pattengill School	298	39%
John Allen School	402	37%
Washtenaw Alliance for Virtual Education ***	20	35%
Abbot School	300	31%
Clifford E. Bryant Comm. School	311	31%
Dicken Elementary School	344	29%
Haisley Elementary School	333	28%
Lakewood Elementary School	306	27%
Logan Elementary School	329	24%
Huron High School	1,537	22%
Tappan Middle School	771	21%
Forsythe Middle School	670	19%

Northside Elementary School	599	18%
Pioneer High School	1,772	18%
Skyline High School	1,494	18%
Angell School	336	17%
Burns Park Elementary School	468	16%
Slauson Middle School	797	16%
Eberwhite School	356	15%
Clague Middle School	687	14%
Bach Elementary School	361	13%
Thurston Elementary School	445	13%
Uriah H. Lawton School	501	12%
Community High School	535	9%
Wines Elementary School	453	9%
Ann Arbor Open at Mack School	527	8%
Early College Alliance ***	64	8%
Martin Luther King Elem. School	494	7%

**SOURCE:** [https://www.mlive.com/news/index.ssf/2017/05/see\\_2016-17\\_subsidized\\_lunch\\_r.html?appSession=400926DCV82T0A5UTWEG26723287H60805DJ15UQD51253L05ZNXJZO6Z3D3J44M4GO16O6435V32FRW26N9BZ0RN8CCI46O7E49MO20S2DBCZ5DAY649FPG0SEL9YCT](https://www.mlive.com/news/index.ssf/2017/05/see_2016-17_subsidized_lunch_r.html?appSession=400926DCV82T0A5UTWEG26723287H60805DJ15UQD51253L05ZNXJZO6Z3D3J44M4GO16O6435V32FRW26N9BZ0RN8CCI46O7E49MO20S2DBCZ5DAY649FPG0SEL9YCT)

---

**From:** Simone Samano <si\_samano@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 17, 2018 9:18 AM  
**To:** Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>  
**Cc:** Julie Grand <juliebgrand@gmail.com>; Ackerman, Zach <ZAckerman@a2gov.org>; Andy LaBarre <andy.labarre@gmail.com>  
**Subject:** Burton project bad for schools/area!

Dear Planning Commission members,

As a 16 year resident of the Darlington neighborhood, and a former member of the executive board of the AAPS PTO Council, I have repeatedly asked both my city council and county representatives to support projects that enhance our area and our schools rather than perpetuate a detrimental idea that we are the "poor" "undesirable" side of town.

Building an ugly four-story apartment building that is out of character with the single-family neighborhood it will loom over, and that has a large percentage of affordable housing, is not a welcome or practical addition to our area.

Our quality southeast schools (Pittsfield, Mitchell, Scarlett) already have the highest percentage of free and reduced lunch families. We pride ourselves on being economically and ethnically diverse but that "lunch number" means we already serve more than our share of struggling families.



We are Title 1 schools which means that more of our kids require extra educational support and services. That also means our hardworking PTOs tend to have less money with which to supplement our kids' school needs than other A2 schools.

The city is already building a large subsidized housing development on Platt, north of Loraine, which adds to other subsidized housing already here and the fact that we are one of the most affordable areas already.

I understand that Burton is zoned for single family development - why not build middle income houses which would be a in keeping with the adjoining neighborhood and would help maintain an economically balanced school population?

When Mr. Ackerman was first running to represent us he came to my house and I expressed much of the above to him. He said he was sympathetic and as a struggling recent graduate he would probably only be able to afford to live in our wonderful neighborhood.

I do not believe Mr. Ackerman has moved here. Furthermore, I was shocked to hear that he is involved with the development of this building. If that is so, it is a stunning conflict of interest and a betrayal of his constituents. I have not met one person in this area that supports that building. It is zoned as single family for good reason.

Demonstrate that you are responsive to what our community wants and needs. For the sake of our schools, and in deference to all the other concerns local residents have presented to you, please do not allow this project to go forward.

Respectfully,  
Simone McDaniel  
2510 Elmwood Ave.