

March 27, 2015

Matt Kowalski
Ann Arbor Planning and Development Services Unit
100 North Fifth Avenue
P.O. Box 8647
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48107-8647

Dear Mr. Kowalski:

We are neighbors directly affected by the proposed Davis Row Condominiums. We have reviewed materials posted through eTRAKIT and wish to submit the following comments and questions about the project:

1) We are curious about the builder's calculations regarding the required setbacks for front, side and rear of the building. By our rough estimate, the building is approximately 80 feet wide (possibly more). If so, this would mean an additional required rear setback of at least 45 inches and the scale of the building would be somewhat reduced. Could the builder seek a variance? If so, we strongly oppose this.

2) We understand that the total of all decks and accessory buildings cannot be more than 35% of the required open space in the rear of the building. Has the builder provided the requested (and correct) calculations about the open space? Can the builder simply request another variance to get around this requirement?

3) Has the builder provided the requested information about the height of the building? The building's height contributes significantly to the overall feeling that it is out of scale with homes in the area. We may not be able to challenge this, but it does concern us greatly.

4) The information provided in the summary of the Citizen Participation Meeting is totally misleading. First of all, no attempt was made to record the attendance. The statement that eleven neighbors were present is patently false. We recall that at most 12 individuals were present, five of whom were not neighbors. (These included two people from Maven, Mr. and Mrs. Fishman, and Doug Smith, a commercial property developer who lives outside the Davis/Hoover neighborhood.) Neighbors who own 128 W. Hoover and 126 W. Hoover (abutting south of the property) received no notice of the meeting, did not attend, and had no opportunity to provide feedback.

Most emphatically, we dispute the veracity of the final paragraph in the summary of the meeting. The petitioners create the impression that happy neighbors spent most of the meeting expressing their delight with the entire project. This

is patently false. The majority of the time was spent on the presentation by the developer. However, no detailed information and no site plan were provided in advance of the meeting. This put neighbors at a huge disadvantage, as they had no opportunity to examine the site plan, think about their concerns, or formulate questions until they were confronted with the site plan for the first time at the meeting. The impression conveyed was that all legal/technical matters had been resolved and that the developer was there to explain what would happen. There were some positive comments, but absolutely **no one** expressed pleasure at the scale of this project. There was general relief that the property was not designated for student housing and that plans were made to control water runoff.

The summary that was submitted was skewed. We believe that the people who attended the first meeting did not get the kind of meeting to which they were entitled. The people who were not notified did not get any meeting at all. *We request a second, more substantive, citizen participation meeting to address these questions and many more.* In addition, we request that this letter be placed on record in rebuttal to the summary provided by the petitioner.

5) We recognize that the rezoning of the Davis/Hoover area from R4C to R2A is not yet in effect. However, the recommendation of the R4C/R2A Zoning District Advisory Committee reflects the belief that this is still a true neighborhood that should be preserved. We can attest that this is the case for us. We really do have a neighborhood feeling that will be changed by this comparatively large and intrusive condominium development. It will dwarf the small home to the west of it and will block pleasant views for the three families to the south of it. We all understand the owner's right to construct a building. However, the scale of the building is very distressing. The owner of this property does not live in the neighborhood and has taken no interest in it. As an example, the owner's dilapidated warehouse (to the east of the proposed development) has been an eyesore for as long as any of us can remember and, it appears, will continue to be so.

6) Variances that the builder requests appear to result primarily from the scale of the proposed building and the builder's attempt to squeeze as much as possible onto the site involved. The neighborhood will be adversely affected if variances are granted. For example, the variance requested to allow tandem parking is based on an unrealistic assumption that luxury condo owners will find it convenient to have their cars parked in this way. It is more likely that street parking will be frequently used so that cars in the garages do not have to be constantly shifted.

The neighbors who will be impacted by the proposed condominium project strongly oppose the granting of any zoning variances for this project. Not only does the plan presented by the petitioner disregard the recommendation of the

R4C/R2A Zoning District Advisory Committee, it goes beyond even the regular R4C zoning by its request for additional variances. While R4C zoning does give a builder legal protection and rights, the zoning rules and regulations are intended to provide the Davis/Hoover neighborhood with protection as well.

We would much appreciate being kept informed in a timely manner of future developments.

Respectfully submitted,

Philip Roe and Jacqueline Roe, owners and residents of 124 W Hoover Ave.

Ann Levenick, owner and resident of 122 W Hoover Ave.

Claire Konicek, resident of 126 W Hoover Ave.

Monique Sluymers and Sandro Tuccinardi, owners of 126 W Hoover Ave.

Dan Boyk, owner and resident of 128 W Hoover Ave.

cc: Mr Chuck Warpehoski, Ward Five Council Member
Mr. Mike Anglin, Ward Five Council Member