

From: [Mark P](#)
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Written Comment for July 7 Hearing — SP26-0003 / REZ24-0008, Woodbury Gardens, 1310 Wisteria Drive
Date: Sunday, July 5, 2026 5:05:50 PM
Attachments: [WOODB~2.pdf](#)

Dear Chair and Members of the Planning Commission,

Please find our attached written comment on the Woodbury Gardens rezoning and site plan (SP26-0003/REZ24-0008), submitted ahead of the July 7 hearing and comment deadline. We are longtime Iroquois Place residents, and our letter raises concerns about the TC1 zoning standard, the rezoning process and precedent, affordability, and the traffic record.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,
Mark and Susan W. Pearlman
1306 Iroquois Pl Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Mark and Susan Pearlman
1306 Iroquois Place
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

July 6, 2026

Ann Arbor City Planning Commission
c/o Jill Thacher, City Planner
301 E. Huron Street
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
Submitted via email: planning@a2gov.org

Re: SP26-0003 / REZ24-0008 — Woodbury Gardens (1310 Wisteria Drive) — Written Comment for July 7, 2026 Public Hearing

Dear Chair and Members of the Planning Commission:

We are Mark and Susan Pearlman, homeowners on Iroquois Place for 36 years, writing in advance of the July 7 public hearing on the Woodbury Gardens rezoning and site plan (SP26-0003/REZ24-0008). Susan is a third-generation Ann Arbor resident; our children are the fourth generation in this city, and our grandchildren are being raised in Washtenaw County. Mark has spent 30 years on the faculty at Michigan Medicine, in numerous leadership roles including associate chief/interim chief of staff, medical director of pharmacy, and vice chair/interim department chair of Obstetrics and Gynecology — work built on the premise that change, well-designed and carefully sequenced, improves outcomes. We recite this not to establish standing alone, but to make clear that our concerns with this proposal are not resistance to change or to housing growth; they are concerns about whether this particular rezoning, on this particular site, meets the standards the city has set for itself. We ask the Commission to recommend denial of REZ24-0008 as currently conditioned, or, in the alternative, to recommend approval only if conditioned as set out below.

UDC 5.12.9.B(1) confines the TC1 district to “rare and unique instances” where a parcel is entirely surrounded by the districts it replaces. Staff’s own July 7 report concedes that “a little less than half of the site is surrounded” by those districts — a plain acknowledgment that the textual threshold is not met. Staff’s response is that the applicant’s height-tier conditions “mitigate” this shortfall. Mitigation is not satisfaction. A conditions package that softens the practical effect of a rezoning cannot substitute for meeting the zoning ordinance’s own eligibility standard, and we ask the Commission not to recommend TC1 on a standard staff itself does not claim is clearly met.

This is also not the Commission’s first look at this project. On January 21, 2026, the Commission rejected the prior version of this site plan because the proposed building exceeded the 300-foot maximum width by 52 feet. The applicant’s fix was to split the oversized building in two — a technical correction that left the substantive questions of affordability, the TC1 standard above, and process untouched. Those questions matter beyond this parcel: this petition rezones the entire 41-acre Woodbury Gardens complex, not just the construction site, and city staff’s own review notes that because the surrounding parcels are being rezoned simultaneously, whatever conditions the Commission attaches here will function as the template for the rest of the complex. The city has elsewhere pursued TC1 rezoning deliberately and

corridor-wide — South State/Eisenhower and West Stadium/North Maple in 2022 — with the Washtenaw/Stadium corridor, which this site fronts, still awaiting its own public process. Approving this applicant-initiated rezoning ahead of that process sets precedent for every other parcel on the corridor, including those closest to Iroquois Place, which already sits under pressure from the two arterials, Stadium and Packard, that bound it.

The 2024 application's own Housing Information Sheet shows 352 units, 72 percent studio or one-bedroom, rental-only, with the price range listed as "unknown" — no affordability commitment of any kind. TC1 conditional rezoning gives the Commission no mechanism to require one; a Planned Unit Development would. The Comprehensive Land Use Plan calls for a mix of housing types and income levels in the Transition tier this site occupies, and a project weighted this heavily toward unrestricted, single-occupancy-style units does not advance that goal merely by adding density. We ask that any approval be conditioned on a binding, recorded affordability set-aside, and that added unit count alone not be treated as satisfying the CLUP's housing-type goals.

The record raises further questions the Commission should weigh: the applicant's own traffic study shows the East Stadium Boulevard/Packard Street intersection already operating at a failing Level of Service (LOS F) on its northbound approach (up to 214 seconds of delay), a condition the project measurably worsens even as the study characterizes overall impact as minimal; the background traffic growth rate applied was drawn from a 2023 email about an unrelated intersection several miles away, not this corridor; pedestrian impact was dismissed as negligible despite the applicant's own counts showing crosswalk volumes near the city's threshold for enhanced treatment; and the parking garage has been reduced from 456 to 369 spaces since the traffic study was completed, without the study being updated to reflect it.

We respectfully request that the Commission:

1. Recommend denial of REZ24-0008 as currently conditioned; or
2. If inclined to recommend approval, condition that recommendation on: (a) a binding, recorded affordability set-aside; (b) express findings addressing the TC1 purpose-statement mismatch rather than relying on height tiers alone; (c) an updated traffic study reflecting the final building and garage configuration; and (d) an explicit finding that this approval does not establish a template for the remainder of Woodbury Gardens or the broader corridor; and
3. Ensure these concerns are preserved in the record for City Council's consideration regardless of the Commission's recommendation.

Thank you for your consideration and for the work the Commission does balancing growth with the standards that are supposed to govern it. We are glad to provide any additional information that would assist your review.

Respectfully,

Mark Pearlman, MD
Susan W. Pearlman
1306 Iroquois Pl
Ann Arbor, MI 48104