

Subject: 805 Oxford Rd Plan
Attachments: 805 oxford Letter J Post April 7 meeting.docx

From: H. V. Jagadish
Sent: Monday, April 20, 2026 3:50 PM
To: Melin-Corcoran, Mariana <MMelin-Corcoran@a2gov.org>
Cc: Manor, Courtney <CManor@a2gov.org>; Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>
Subject: 805 Oxford Rd Plan

Dear Ms. Melin-Corcoran,

Please find attached a document prepared by the neighbors of 805 Oxford. In this document, and its attachments, we have clarified several points that were brought up during the recent planning commission meeting. Since there was some confusion about facts, such as the built area of the existing (versus the proposed) structure, we would appreciate it if this document were included with materials considered in future discussions of this site.

Thank you

H V Jagadish

Post-meeting Notes from neighbors regarding 805 Oxford, discussed at the April 7 meeting of the Ann Arbor Planning Commission.

Respected commissioners,

Thank you for your attention to the matter of 805 Oxford, discussed at your meeting on April 7 2026. We understand that all of you serve on this committee to help Ann Arbor and we really appreciate your time and involvement.

We would like to state our takeaways from the meeting, and our discussion since then towards devising a plan that permits the establishment of a large student group house while minimizing damage to the environment:

1) Zoning: There are multiple single-family homes adjoining 805 Oxford and most of these are zoned R2A or R1C. There is only one adjacent single family home (809 Oxford) that is R2B. All of these are South and East of 805 Oxford, while student group houses are to the North and West. So any group house construction in this lot should be to the North and West as much as possible.

2) Scale: The current footprint (i.e., the space on the ground that the current structures take up) is 3766.3 square feet including the garage and the connector (please see attached Appendix for calculations) whereas the planned structure will take up 8000 ft.².

Some people had walked the property and found the current structure gigantic-- in fact, they believed it was 8000 sq. ft. The proposed building will have a footprint more than double this size. This will be out of proportion in the neighborhood, and substantially larger than even the largest student group house in the vicinity.

3) Tear Down of a 19th century historic home in Ann Arbor: The current living capacity of 805 Oxford (per the [Zillow listing in 2025](#)) is 8,670 ft.² (6,121 ft.² w/an additional 2,549 ft.² in the finished lower level). Of the 6,121 ft.², about 1500 ft.² is above the garage. If the garage is converted into living quarters (there is already an apartment above the garage), that adds about 1400 ft.² making it a total of over 10,000 ft.² If a third floor can be added to the current structure, that's about 13,766 ft.², which is almost the size of the largest student group house in the vicinity.

The petitioner will be spending millions in tearing down this unique 19th century house, which is in excellent condition, to re-grading and build a new house. Compare this to putting in sprinklers and an elevator for the disabled (which is what they said held them back) and adapting the house – the cost for this would be much lower, and the environmental damage infinitely lower.

We also note a CLUP priority: *“Increasing density by building up rather than building out is seen as necessary to have a greater impact on preserving ecologically beneficial green spaces...”*

4) Trees: We are very concerned about trees the petitioners propose to cut down. We note that if they could use the existing house, or even if they built a new building on roughly the old footprint, there would be no need to cut trees. If it becomes necessary to construct elsewhere, we believe it should be possible to save a significant cluster of trees in the SE part of the lot, by making small adjustments to the placement of the new building and parking lot. See detailed tree recommendation below.

Another quote from the CLUP “..Parkland and natural features are cherished features of a high quality of life. Their preservation must be balanced with growth..”

5) Communication: The petitioner has had little communication with the neighbors. The only conversation that the petitioner has had with us was on the day of the hearing. As such, we may need the city to require details that are normally left to the parties to work out. For example, the code requires the petitioner to put up a 6 foot tall privacy fence. The neighbors would like this to be in a dark natural wood color to best blend with surroundings, and would like that this be put in place when construction begins (rather than when construction ends). Can we get things like this in writing with the permit?

In summary, **our recommendation is that the petitioner should look into updating the existing house, and extending it or reconstructing parts of it if need be, for minimum damage to the environment, to the neighborhood, and to history.** We believe that should be possible, if the scale of the project is reduced to be in concurrence with the neighborhood. In the major storm we had last week, several of us lost major trees. This makes it all the more critical that the grove of trees identified in the attached tree plan be saved.

Yours Sincerely,

Elizabeth Hirschfield and Aniket Dhadphale, 1817 Cambridge Road

Aradhna Krishna and H V Jagadish, 1835 Cambridge Road

David Patterson, 1942 Cambridge Road

Scotti Parrish and Bruce Judge, 1945 Cambridge Road

Elizaveta Levina and Edward Ionides, 1950 Cambridge Road

April 20, 2026

Appendix A: Tree Plan for SE of the lot

These are the landmark trees in the SE grove (all numbers refer to the tree plan filed by the petitioner):

1178 is a big and beautiful black walnut and is a landmark tree

1179 is a very pretty hackberry landmark tree

1180 is a lovely sassafras landmark tree

1250 is an absolutely gorgeous big-toothed aspen landmark tree

1174 and 1175 are a lovely landmark big-toothed aspen and a black cherry which have merged and both are marked to be cut down. It is not possible to cut one without the other and both should be preserved.

We feel strongly then these landmark trees should not be cut and that any new building should be placed North of these trees. Since these trees are all clustered to the SE of the property, leaving them alone will only push the building envelope by a small amount.

Besides these landmark trees, there are also two Norway maples, which are marked as invasive, and marked for removal

1177 is a really giant and very old Norway maple which should really be retained as if it were a landmark tree.

1251 is a small Norway maple and could be cut, if needed.

1181-1184 and 1253 are locust trees and marked as invasive. It makes sense to cut these down but they should be replaced with pines for shielding from residential neighbors.

AppendixB : Calculation of current footprint

805 Oxford current built area, including house, connector and garage

All calculations in feet (and square feet)

Irregular shape, so total area computed as the sum of 10 component areas.

See image on next page for the areas marked A,B,C,...J

$$A = 14.3 \times 13.9 = 198.8$$

$$B = (32.2 - 13.9) \times (23.9 + 14.3) = 18.3 \times 38.2 = 699.1$$

$$C = 26.3 \times (38.2 + 11.0) = 26.3 \times 49.2 = 1294.0$$

$$D = (47.1 - 26.3 - 18.3) \times 49.2 - d = 2.5 \times 49.2 - 3.1 = 119.9$$

$$\text{Where } d = 2.5 \times 2.5 \times \frac{1}{2} = 3.1$$

$$E = 2.8 \times (49.2 - 15.5 - 2.5) - e = 2.8 \times 31.2 - 3.9 = 83.5$$

$$\text{Where } e = 2.8 \times 2.8 \times \frac{1}{2} = 3.9$$

$$F = 47.5 \text{ (approx.)}$$

$$G = 6.6 \times 6.6 \times \frac{1}{2} = 21.8$$

$$H = (26.3 - 9.8 - 4.6) \times 18.6 = 11.9 \times 18.6 = 221.3$$

$$I = (26.3 - 4.6) \times (27.2 - 18.6 - 6.6) = 21.7 \times 2.0 = 43.4$$

$$J = 26.3 \times (40.6 - 2.0) = 26.3 \times 38.6 = 1015.2$$

$$\text{Total} = A+B+C+\dots+J = 3766.3 \text{ square feet}$$

