

## Kowalski, Matthew

---

**From:** William Higgins [whiggins27@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 04, 2015 10:22 AM  
**To:** Kowalski, Matthew  
**Cc:** Eaton, Jack; Krapohl, Graydon; wwoods@umich.edu; Briere, Sabra  
**Subject:** 2250- City Procedure for Planning Approval

### For distribution to Planning Commission volunteer members

It is apparent that the 2250 Site Plan was completed well before the initial Public Presentation in December of 2014, and several issues brought up by Commission members and the Public which have not been addressed or even recognized.

I would hope that Ms. Rampson's retirement remarks "good growth involves having developers talking to the Community before they start drawing-up plans....." would have some effect in the current and defective process of reviewing the 2250 Proposal, which has demonstrated the contrary.

Not only are there several outrageous details (such as as the lack of buffer zones, the purchase of a detention easement and the payment of 72% of the cost, but especially the rear access of a commercial development into and thru an adjacent neighborhood....), the members should be reminded of other "short cut" realities (as Iroquois at Stadium and Packard) as experienced by the City. The single entrance/exit meets City standards, and the "discretionary" clause is simply inconsistent and is just a way, in this case, to justify a pre-design agreement long before any Public awareness.

The Developer can be successful in some use for his former Township and actually un-zoned property (with decades of surface water disasters) by simply recognizing the rights of adjacent neighborhoods. The stub road was never intended to be extended east, but north (to Maya/Scio Church) and, at most, accommodate only a few single family residences.

If you have any doubts about these remarks, I invite you to cast aside the architects drawings, which reflect only the wishes of the developer/property owner and visit the property from the west, i.e. via Scio Church Road, to Chaucer, then Ascot, then Lamberth. (a short trail will reveal the surface water/drainage problems, the irregular terrain, the dense vegetation, etc). You will then realize the difficulties of the unnecessary access directly to the proposed 2250 underground garage and car-park density.

It is not too late to reap the benefit of Ms. Rampson's goals, and restore some credibility to the review/approval process. (the recent actions by the Historic Commission indicates this is possible)

I hope you will take time to contemplate your assigned goals and use this opportunity to do what is right for our neighborhood and the City as a whole.

Most Sincerely,

William P. Higgins (a 48 year resident at 2131 Chaucer- a neighborhood with severe surface water issues and few effective infrastructure services)