

Lenart, Brett

From: Brigid Kowalczyk <bak.aa47@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 18, 2018 8:52 AM
To: CityCouncil; Planning
Subject: Trinitas building project: voted down!

I am so grateful for the unanimous vote, last night by City Council, against the student housing project that Trinitas wanted to build on Pontiac Trail. Thank you for making a sensible choice for Ann Arbor.

As I have said before, can we consider building a Park and Ride in this plot of land? I know they are ugly but that can be remedied with some attention. Rezoning would be necessary. Jurisdiction would be required: the city, the AATA, the state or a private developer (is there one?)

Benefits: over a 1000 cars come down Pontiac Trail now to go into the City and park. If many of them parked at this outskirts of town, the parking problems in town would be relieved. There are already two bus routes that could stop at this location and bring drivers / commuters to the center of town or to the Main UM hospital area. Removing cars that now have to pass through the Barton Drive and Pontiac Trail intersection and past Northside school would improve safety for the remaining travelers and students.

Thank you for voting NO. Please consider this option instead of more residential housing! The Pontiac Trail corridor is already developed enough. Safety and parking should be priorities now.

--

Brigid Kowalczyk
459 Skydale Dr.

"Do not wish to be anything but what you are, and try to be that perfectly."

- St. Francis de Sales -

Lenart, Brett

From: Evan Daywell <evan.daywell@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 14, 2018 10:45 PM
To: Planning
Subject: 2805 burton road development

Hello

I'm a long time resident of Ann Arbor and I just read an article about the development on burton road (see link below).

I want to understand why our city planning doesn't support greater density development, especially when it comes with increased affordability and open space.

My family is fortunate enough to have found a home in Arrowwood but we struggled severely for many years to find a place to live in the town we love.

I know there are a lot of components that add up to the affordability crisis we've experienced, but one of them is certainly supply and demand.

I see low-density luxury condos sprawling across the outskirts of town, and then hear about higher density affordable options being blocked closer in, and I wonder what the logic is.

Can you explain?

Thank you much,
Evan Daywell

https://www.mlive.com/news/ann-arbor/index.ssf/2018/09/brightdawn_village_developer_c.html

Lenart, Brett

From: Philip McMillion <philmcmill@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 06, 2018 1:11 PM
To: Planning
Cc: Smith, Chip; Warpehoski, Chuck
Subject: Feedback on 9/5/18 Planning Commission meeting

I want to thank the Planning Commission on the postponement of the Lockwood project - it was the prudent thing to do, but probably not for the reasons mentioned. I felt this was being rushed through without citizen involvement.

City planning staff shut out representatives from the Sister Lakes neighborhoods all summer long. They would only agree to meet with us last week after everything was settled (and supposedly unchangeable) and a planning commission meeting scheduled. At least Lockwood had a citizen's participation meeting (not a very useful one, but at least they had one). A key concern from the May 1, 2018 meeting about having developers work with the neighborhood (for PUD) didn't really address a major problem with this project - the city planning staff being indifferent to neighborhood concerns, shutting them out of the process, and working as an advocate for the developer.

I appreciate city planning staff meeting with me individually last Friday, but they were inflexible and unwilling to listen to reason (they agreed with my premise, but couldn't agree that 58 parking spots needed for residents and staff was larger than 55 non-handicap spots available, based on Lockwood's own estimates). The last minute addition to the agenda packet to address parking was a sham (filled with bogus attachments, inconsistent or incorrect information, and a teaser proposal to add more parking spaces without it actually being included in the PUD). If anyone is interested, I'd be willing to get specific. Also, Brett Lenart said he would bring up a number of parking issues with the developer at the meeting, but did not do so. One in particular was parking numbers/estimates submitted to eTRAKit versus verbal assurances that there is no problem.

I wonder if we lived in a more affluent neighborhood (as opposed to our "shithole" neighborhood) if we would be so steamrolled by planning. I truly appreciate the comments by commissioner Woods about how if this were in Burns Park that some of the neighborhood concerns would be taken more seriously.

With all due respect, councilman/commissioner Ackerman totally mis-interpreted the description in the master plan regarding the adjacent commercial car dealerships encroaching on the neighborhood. It is precisely the proximity of the dealerships to our neighborhood (with the light and noise pollution) that the master plan says no commercial sites should be built on that location. Noise from the west, noise to the north, and if this project passes, noise to the east.

Even Matt Kowalski admitted to me when I met with him on Friday 8/31 that from a land use perspective, it is totally reasonable to interpret the master plan as indicating a commercial site is not desirable. If the Lockwood project didn't have a commercial kitchen and dining (with the corresponding delivery trucks) it could be considered compatible with the master plan, but because of the commercial aspect it is not. While some can try to spin it otherwise, it is not compatible with the Master Plan and should not be re-zoned. Inappropriate re-zoning and inconsistency with the master plan should be much bigger deals for the planning commission.

Thanks again for the postponement. While I understand and agree with the concerns about impact on the dioxane plume and the need for more affordable and senior housing, it is the inappropriate re-zoning and it being too big for that space (with lack of parking being a tangible example) which should be obvious areas of concern, and reasons for the project to be rejected outright.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Phil McMillion
133 Westover 48103

Lenart, Brett

From: Donna Pointer <dpointer@mac.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2018 11:14 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Lockwood of Ann Arbor Site Plan proposed rezoning to PUD

I live in Lakewood subdivision. I have the following comments relative to this rezoning for Lockwood's proposed "senior housing" complex. This development sounds similar to Lurie Terrace, which is not assisted living and provides 3 meals a day. Each unit provides a kitchen area. I spoke to one of the Lockwood people after the meeting. He said this was not "senior housing"; but that is what they were touting at their very first meeting. Their rationale for so few parking places was that "seniors don't drive." They will take the bus or walk where they want to go.

I was surprised that the safety and transportation needs of the proposed residents was not mentioned at the Sept. 5 meeting. I'm a senior and I drive all around, but I take the bus downtown often. Here are my comments relative to seniors taking the bus anywhere to/from the Lockwood site:

It's quite a walk to Wagner and Jackson, where the nearest bus stop is. They could take the 30 into town, but if they take that one back, they have to go way out to Meijer's and then double back to be dropped off once again on the south side of Jackson at Wagner and Jackson. There is no way to cross Jackson from the north side because Jackson goes around Webers. The Lockwood representative said they could take the 30 into town and then take the 31 back, which would also drop them at Wagner and Jackson. Again, this is a very long walk for a senior who is taking the bus because they "don't drive". Imagine a senior with a walker. It's definitely not safe. To get out to Meijer's they'd have to get to Jackson and Wagner, cross 5 lanes of Wagner west, then cross 5 lanes of Jackson north to get to the 30 bus stop. Coming back they'd get off at Wagner and Jackson and still have to walk quite a distance to the Lockwood development. Can you imagine this all with a walker? This site is VERY different from where Lockwood ordinarily locates, on busy bus routes, close to shopping. I don't think Lockwood has thought this through.

I assume these will be apartments, but I don't know if they have kitchens. Lurie Terrace does. Where and how are these people going to do grocery shopping, or does Lockwood think they will be holed up taking all their meals (probably at extra cost) on site? It's not walking distance to anywhere except car dealerships and motels. Certainly they don't expect seniors to bike everywhere.

Also the Lockwood representative tonight told me this was NOT going to be senior housing. But that was their supposed big selling point at their first presentation at Webers. Now it is basically a big apartment house. It certainly is not "homes" or even condos. 95 units probably would have at least 100 people and only 65 parking places. Assuming 15 for employees that leaves only about 50 for the tenants. How many will be free and how many will they charge extra for? Will they have covered parking like Lurie Terrace so the "seniors" don't have to rake snow off their vehicles in the winter?

This is a tremendous benefit for the Lockwood organization—not so much for the future residents.

Donna Pointer
310 Galake Ave.