

847-476-9944

On Wed, Jun 3, 2026, 6:06 AM Daniel Johnson wrote:

Dear Mr. Moore,

Good morning.

Regarding the Notice received for the above-referenced meeting, attached are questions prepared by the Watershed neighborhood concerning the proposed rezoning for Glazier Heights.

Regards,

Daniel Johnson
IN-SITE LLC

PROPOSED GLAZIER HEIGHTS DEVELOPMENT - CONSOLIDATED QUESTION LIST

June 2, 2026

APPLICATION INFORMATION

1. On the submitted “Checklist of Required Information for Site Plans” the Citizen Participation section has a note “Not done yet 4/14/26” – has the applicant completed the Type 1 requirements including the timing of those requirements? What is the schedule for the issuance of the Final Citizen Participation Report?
2. The City of Ann Arbor “Checklist of Required Information for Site Plans” form that was submitted was dated “CLH Revised 9/5/2024” and a more current check list form exists. Can the current Ann Arbor form be completed and all supporting documentation be updated to include any missing information?

PROPOSED REZONING

The **R4E Multi-Family Residential District** allows **75 dwelling units per acre** and has **no height limitation** per Table 5.17.3.

3. Why is R4E being proposed as the zoning district which far exceeds the densities for single family properties in the surrounding neighborhoods and the multi-family properties in the immediate area including Geddes Lakes and Oslund?
4. Why is the developer requesting the least restrictive multi-family residential zone change (R4E) when more restrictive zone changes would suffice for this project?
5. A “signature transit corridor” is a specified condition associated with the R4E rezoning adoption guidelines. Glazier Way is not designated for that status in the latest Master Plan. Why is R4E being proposed if it does not conform to that zoning district criteria?
6. Why is the developer proposing a voluntary 65-foot height limitation if the plan calls for 4 story townhouses that are noted as 45 feet high? Is there a duration for this voluntary height restriction? How will this voluntary height duration be included in the zoning maps and its duration if applicable?
7. Are 4-story buildings intended as noted on the Cover Sheet? The recent M-Live article indicated 3-story buildings. Please clarify?
8. Will the developer volunteer, as has been done on height to restrict the inclusion of Fraternities, Sororities, Student Cooperative Housing, and guest houses as permitted by the R4E designation in their application?

TRAFFIC AND GLAZIER WAY ENTRANCE

In the area of the proposed entrance on Glazier Way, there is a 14% grade and a curving profile to the street. The residents in the area experience heavy peak time AM & PM traffic to and from the Medical Center area and winter time driving can be quite hazardous and back-ups are not uncommon.

9. Has City Engineering & Traffic weighed in on this proposed driveway location on Glazier Way and a specific level of service intersection considerations?
10. The Midwestern Consulting Traffic Report (March 3, 2026) submitted for the project (paragraph 1.2.2) indicates “single family-attached style” development as compared to the “Multi-Family Residential District” proposed in the rezoning request and an emergency only access connection is referenced at Ridgeline Drive. The Site Plan indicates only a watermain connection and a sidewalk connection to Ridgeline Drive. Can you clarify the contradictions?
11. Was a left turn lane considered for west bound traffic entering the project to avoid AM peak time traffic backing up with the proximity to the stop sign at Green Road?
12. Were a deceleration lane and acceleration lane considered for the east bound traffic entering and leaving the project?
13. How will construction deliveries and truck traffic access the site?
14. Although there appear to be two access routes, both feed into Glazier Way. Has the City evaluated whether this effectively functions as a single constrained access corridor during periods of congestion, accidents, snow, or icy conditions?
15. Has an independent emergency vehicle access study been conducted considering that both entrances depend on the same steep Glazier Way corridor?
16. During peak traffic periods, school drop-off times, or winter weather events, how will fire trucks and ambulances reliably access the area if traffic backs up onto Glazier Way?
17. Has the Fire Department reviewed whether the proposed density is appropriate for a site where both access points depend on the same already-congested roadway?
18. If one section of Glazier Way becomes blocked due to an accident, stalled vehicle, construction activity, or severe weather, what alternative emergency access options would remain available?
19. Given the steep terrain, winter driving concerns, and dependence on a single corridor, has the City considered whether the proposed zoning intensity creates avoidable public safety risks and future liability for the City?
20. In the “Northeast Area Future Land Use circa 2006 for “Northeast Area – Site 23” there was a recommendation for accessing the site from Lakehaven.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE

21. Have the storm water implications for the development been reviewed with the Washtenaw County Water Resource Commissioner's Office?
22. Given the importance of the Millers Creek water shed, will the developer commit to having the projects engineering firm (that completed the storm water management plan) conduct a public meeting for the responsible city and county agencies as well as adjacent property owners to present the storm water plan and associated assumptions and calculations?
23. Can you explain the recent reason for the work associated with the storm water outlet headwall construction located on Lakehaven that directs flow onto the adjacent church property to the west?
24. The Infiltration Evaluation states the "assumption of negligible infiltration into the underlying soils" exist for this development. A review of the site contours and the location of the roadways and housing (Impenetrable surfaces) would direct storm water primarily toward residences that border Watershed Drive and secondarily toward the Geddes Lake community. Does the storm surge volume anticipated by this project exceed the current capacity of installed storm sewer systems in these locations (it is unclear in the storm water management sheets)?
25. Residents on Watershed Drive have reported ponding on the cul-de-sac during rain events. Will the City or WCWRC in their planning review ensure that the project will not create a storm surge issue with current properties and structures?
26. Is the relocation of overhead power/phone/cable lines on Glazier Way planned for the proposed development? Is locating the same underground being considered? In either case can the developer facilitate the relocation of noted overhead power lines to underground to reduce weather and storm disruptions?
27. Has there been an evaluation of the overall utility infrastructure capacity and availability for water, sewer, and franchise utilities for the proposed density of the development?

NATURAL FEATURES CONSIDERATIONS

The protection of natural features is an important consideration in any development project in the City of Ann Arbor. This property is unique in the steep topography features and is reported to have 457 existing trees including many which would be classified as "landmark".

28. How many landmark trees will be removed as part of the proposed development?
29. Why does the Site plan lack calculated and paid canopy loss fee for any proposed tree removals? (see the City of Ann Arbor Forestry website for latest Canopy Loss Fee Rate)
30. There are numerous retaining walls indicated on the site plan including a retaining near the northeast corner of the proposed plan. Has a tree survey been conducted for the tree locations on the neighbor's property in that area to verify that there would be no impact on the root system of existing trees in the neighbor's west rear yards because of the retaining wall construction?
31. Ann Arbor's A2Zero program has a stated goal of preserving the city's canopy to offset carbon emissions, which this plan clearly contradicts. How do the developers plan to neutralize that loss?

OTHER

32. If a brownfield condition exists on this property, has a brown field application been submitted or will it be submitted?
33. Will there be any city, county, or state funds requested, expended, or dedicated to this project now or in the future and what are they?
34. If a TIF district is proposed for this proposed development, what is an estimate of the property tax diversion or loss to infrastructure improvements attributable to the area of the proposed development?
35. Will the developer be required to pay their proportionate share of the Glazier Way Special Assessment District (SAD) when Glazier Way was improved 26 years ago?
36. The project plans show large commercial trash dumpsters at locations on the property. Is it your intent to only have commercial trash dumpsters to service the seventy-six condominium units or will individual units have curbside trash cans for municipal pickup? If these units are intended for affordable housing using commercial trash dumpsters why is this additional cost being added for the residents?
37. What is the developer's plan for the ongoing program for rodent control at the commercial trash dumpsters?
38. Adjacent sidewalk availability is not shown on the site plan for units 60,61, or 62. Should this be addressed, corrected, or listed as an exception?

The above-mentioned questions were developed in conjunction with the following list of concerned citizens primarily from the Watershed neighborhood:

"Sun, Eleanor" <elsun@med.umich.edu>,
Daniel Johnson <djohnson@in-site.us.com>,
"amy.michelle.beck@gmail.com" <amy.michelle.beck@gmail.com>,
"carriersb@gmail.com" <carriersb@gmail.com>,
"cjsnort46@aol.com" <cjsnort46@aol.com>,
"dadzemov@umich.edu" <dadzemov@umich.edu>,
"dmuir@umich.edu" <dmuir@umich.edu>,
"ecabbenante@gmail.com" <ecabbenante@gmail.com>,
"hamurt@gmail.com" <hamurt@gmail.com>,
"harris.andrew.w@gmail.com" <harris.andrew.w@gmail.com>,
"Harder, Jennifer" <jlharder@med.umich.edu>,
"keenarb@gmail.com" <keenarb@gmail.com>,
"mavrakotos@me.com" <mavrakotos@me.com>,
"mike.adzemovic@gmail.com" <mike.adzemovic@gmail.com>,
"msfleming77@comcast.net" <msfleming77@comcast.net>,
"onadgorny@gmail.com" <onadgorny@gmail.com>,
"pdabbenante@gmail.com" <pdabbenante@gmail.com>,
"ridgeline@krans.org" <ridgeline@krans.org>,
"subhash@umich.edu" <subhash@umich.edu>,
"svijan@umich.edu" <svijan@umich.edu>,
"wmsilvis@comcast.net" <wmsilvis@comcast.net>,
Boris Edward Nadgorny <Boris_Nadgorny@wayne.edu>,
"tracygrogan@me.com" <tracygrogan@me.com>,
"joelrubenstein1@gmail.com" <joelrubenstein1@gmail.com>,
"andrew.mullard@gmail.com" <andrew.mullard@gmail.com>,
"gadepallimd@gmail.com" <gadepallimd@gmail.com>,
"bksilvis@gmail.com" <bksilvis@gmail.com>,
"minisuzanne@gmail.com" <minisuzanne@gmail.com>,
"loh.jerry.d@gmail.com" <loh.jerry.d@gmail.com>,
"kbowdler@sbcglobal.net" <kbowdler@sbcglobal.net>,
"jonbowdler@gmail.com"
christopher.couch@gmail.com
katz.laurenashley@gmail.com