

**From:** Lynn Borset <[lmborset@umich.edu](mailto:lmborset@umich.edu)>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 16, 2020 1:59 PM  
**To:** Planning <[Planning@a2gov.org](mailto:Planning@a2gov.org)>  
**Cc:** Ramlawi, Ali <[ARamlawi@a2gov.org](mailto:ARamlawi@a2gov.org)>; Briggs, Erica <[EBriggs@a2gov.org](mailto:EBriggs@a2gov.org)>  
**Subject:** 2060 W. Stadium proposed development

This message was sent from outside of the City of Ann Arbor. Please do not click links, open attachments, or follow directions unless you recognize the source of this email and know the content is safe.

November 16, 2020

Hello Planning Commission members,

And welcome to the new Planning Commissioners.

I'm writing with concerns about the site plan proposed for redevelopment of 2060 W. Stadium. This proposal seems a very poor use, and a very poor fit, for this 2.3 acre plot of land in the shopping district of W. Stadium. I urge you to reject this site plan, and request the developer to come back with a proposal that would actually be of benefit to this area of Ann Arbor.

I am aware that Staff recommended approval because, with few exceptions (Variances and Zoning changes), it "technically" meets development regulations. Technically it is "compatible with the zoning" and technically it "would not be hazardous or inconvenient nor unduly conflict" with the neighborhood.

But, does this site proposal actually benefit Ann Arbor and its residents? Does it help meet our goals, such as pedestrian friendly, affordable, and carbon neutral? NO.

While it is a commercial enterprise, it is hardly 'mixed use,' as there are eight (soon to be nine) other financial institutions on this stretch of W. Stadium.

The claims that this will improve pedestrian access are questionable at best. Who will walk or bike to their storage compartment?

By requesting 3 drive-thru lanes for the bank, it seems that vehicle rather than pedestrian (or bicycle) access is intended.

The soil contamination on this site, due to the previous automotive business, is of significant concern. The mitigation proposed by the developer is Not reassuring!

You have the authority to deny the requested Variances and Zoning changes, to request the developer to come up with a better plan that is more suitable for this area. I hope you will do so.

Thank you for considering my comments,  
Lynn Borset  
Ward 5.

--

[LMBorset@umich.edu](mailto:LMBorset@umich.edu)

**From:** Jill Crane <[jillyn.crane@gmail.com](mailto:jillyn.crane@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Monday, November 16, 2020 4:30 PM

**To:** Planning <[Planning@a2gov.org](mailto:Planning@a2gov.org)>

**Subject:** 2060 West Stadium Blvd Partial Rezoning - question for Nov 17 Planning Comm meeting

This message was sent from outside of the City of Ann Arbor. Please do not click links, open attachments, or follow directions unless you recognize the source of this email and know the content is safe.

Hello,

I attended the Planning Commission meeting in June where those in attendance saw renderings of the NorthStar Bank and the self-storage building proposed for building on 2060 West Stadium Blvd.

Why is this location considered a good place to build a self-storage building. I checked with 6 self-storage business located west of Stadium Boulevard - all that I talked to have at least 20% of their units available to rent.

Over the past 15 years the city has gone to much effort to beautify West Stadium Blvd - attractive new street lighting; pedestrian islands and cross walks; and road paving. I enjoy all of these improvements and I do most of my shopping on West Stadium Blvd. It's confusing that after the city spent \$ to make West Stadium Boulevard attractive that they are considering this 4.5 story self-storage building (an ugly one at that - it will be painted neon orange and a deep gray).

I understand that the city wants to have a business at this location to pay property tax and I think the city can open up bids for building and find a business that will build s more attractive and a more viable business at 2060 West Stadium Blvd.

I plan to attend the Nov 17 meeting.

Thank you, Jill Crane

Jill Crane  
804 Ivydale Ave.  
Ann Arbor, MI 48103  
734-668-8826

**From:** Steve Glauberman <[steve@glauberman.com](mailto:steve@glauberman.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 16, 2020 4:37 PM  
**To:** Planning <[Planning@a2gov.org](mailto:Planning@a2gov.org)>  
**Cc:** Margaret Schankler <[mschankler@gmail.com](mailto:mschankler@gmail.com)>  
**Subject:** Neighborhood comments concerning 700 N. Main condominium project

This message was sent from outside of the City of Ann Arbor. Please do not click links, open attachments, or follow directions unless you recognize the source of this email and know the content is safe.

City Planners:

Attached please find a letter composed by the neighbors directly impacted by the new proposed 700 N. Main condominium project. While we welcome development of the site, we do have concerns that should be addressed before approval.

Please see attached and feel free to reach out with any questions you may have.

Regards,

--Steve Glauberman

November 16, 2020

Dear Planning Commissioners:

We are writing as members of the North Central Neighborhood Association (NCNA) and as adjacent property owners to the proposed 700 N. Main Near North Condominium Project (Rezoning – Project no. Z18-012, Planned Project Modifications – Project No. SP18-033).

While we welcome development of the site, we have concerns about the proposed setbacks and configuration of the north end of the property as described in the newly submitted plan. **As such, we do not support the approval of this current plan without these issues addressed by the developers.**

Given the length of the time this project has taken to get to this point, there have been many variations of plans submitted over the years and various meetings and conversations have taken place. This has resulted in a lack of consistent communication and understanding of project details. Additionally, the submitted plan is inconsistent -- sometimes referring to 16 units while other times referring to 22 or 23 units.

Specifically, we would want these questions addressed by the developers before the site plan approval is granted.

### **Setbacks Issue**

First, and most important, we would like to address the developer's note in his application that the neighbors have no objection (we do) to the requested setback variances.

- At the last public meeting held on 7-25-18 (notes provided by the developer and the wrong notes linked to in the staff recommendation document) there was no mention of rear setbacks. All neighbors who recall being there only recall discussion of the front setback reduction. We agreed with the reduction to 10 ft. Additionally, at that meeting the number of units presented was 16.
- In the Public Comment notes provided with their application, the developers do not mention rear setbacks at all.
- Further, we are unable to track how the plans presented at the 7-25-18 meeting changed to those presented with the current application.
- The first mention we find of any plans for reduced setbacks is on 7-1-19

- There was a meeting in the city planning commission office with John Hilton, Steve Glauberman and Jim Chaffers at some point to go over the landscape materials. But no one in attendance recalls being told that the rear setbacks were reduced.
- Lastly, we only just learned with this new 2020 submission that the request was for 22 units. We were shown plans with 16 units. While we are generally supportive of the increase in units, we are not supportive of it if it requires a 33% reduction of the rear setback in places and this should have been presented to us by the developers for discussion.
- We are not comfortable with the reduced rear setback as presented. The screening of the conflicting uses should be better defined. We are concerned with the distance from the lot line to the retaining wall as well as to the building. Given the height of the structure, the narrow space between the structure and/or retaining wall and the eastern neighbors' properties, we are concerned adequate screening cannot be created and maintained.
- The developer's claim that reducing the setbacks is warranted due to the difficulty of fitting the building on a narrow site, does not hold sway for us as property owners. Several of us have been limited by zoning as to what we can do in our own backyards. For example, screening an existing porch is considered encroaching on the setback.

### **North Side of Property**

We request that the developer provide more detailed information (and drawings) for all that is proposed on the north side of the property. These items include:

- Excess water runoff and standing water settling into the property at 719 N. Fourth Ave since demolition and grading when the homes were torn down. How will this be addressed? The systems depicted on the site plan for water retention and drainage are not clear to us.
- It would be useful to have renderings or elevations of what the storm water retention structure with patio on top will look like. On the north elevation there is a high wall towards the east in the rear of the building that needs more context. It would also be helpful to understand better the trash enclosure area and guest parking. There is mention in the public comment notes that there will be a trash compactor. Is this written into the plans?

Signed,

Margaret Schankler & Steve Glauberman (711 N. Fourth Ave.)  
 John Hilton & Eve Silberman (701 N. Fourth Ave.)

Kathleen Baxter (719 N. Fourth Ave.)  
Nancy and Gene Eavy (709 N. Fourth Ave.)  
Claude Baker (651 N. Fourth Ave.)  
Cindy and Ovide Pomerleau (637 N. 4th Ave.)  
Ali and Shoku Ahmadi (717 N. Fourth Ave.)  
Jim and Jerry Chaffers (655 N Fourth Ave.)

**From:** Jon Nelson <[nelso4831@gmail.com](mailto:nelso4831@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 16, 2020 5:24 PM  
**To:** Planning <[Planning@a2gov.org](mailto:Planning@a2gov.org)>  
**Subject:** 2060 West Stadium - Zoning Change

This message was sent from outside of the City of Ann Arbor. Please do not click links, open attachments, or follow directions unless you recognize the source of this email and know the content is safe.

Does the city truly believe that it is in the best interests of local residents to ignore code, and allow a proposed business to have less parking than required, and also to change the zoning of the property to further facilitate this?

Nobody wants their home to back up to a 4 story self storage facility. This type of development belongs outside of the greenbelt, not abutting a residential neighborhood.

Furthermore, a 10 foot setback for a massive 4 story warehouse seems grossly out of character with the area in general. Do any buildings of similar size or height encroach so closely to the sidewalk/road?

**From:** Carol Spencer <[carol13.spencer@gmail.com](mailto:carol13.spencer@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Monday, November 16, 2020 3:02 PM

**To:** Planning <[Planning@a2gov.org](mailto:Planning@a2gov.org)>

**Subject:** 2060 W. Stadium

This message was sent from outside of the City of Ann Arbor. Please do not click links, open attachments, or follow directions unless you recognize the source of this email and know the content is safe.

Please include my attached remarks in the communications to the Planning Commission re; 2060 W. Stadium for the meeting on 11/17/2020

Thank you

Carol Spencer

1940 Ivywood Dr.



To members of the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission

I find the proposed development plan for 2060 W. Stadium Blvd incompatible with some of the priorities set forth in the Ann Arbor City Master Plan, which repeatedly references the importance of the relationship between commercial and residential use. It also refers to the promotion and value of locally owned small businesses.

The proposed development, particularly, Public Storage, is incompatible with neighboring, established businesses. It is an oversized, unsightly building that would dwarf its neighbors. It is owned by a Real Estate Investment Trust and does not promote local shopping or services. Additionally, it could become a deterrent to desirable new businesses considering locating on W. Stadium.

The Public Storage building, as proposed, would negatively impact the quality of life of those who reside in the adjacent neighborhood, particularly those whose lots are directly adjacent to the site. The building would block sunlight to adjoining neighbors and beyond. Residents would be confronted with its dominating, unsightly, bleak visual presence daily. I would expect it to negatively impact real estate values for the neighborhood as well. It is too large, too tall, and too close to residences.

**I oppose any rezoning to enable this building to be sited as proposed at its proposed height and proximity to residential properties.**

Thank you, the City Planning Commission, for your serious attention and thoughtful response to the concerns and objections raised by those of us affected by your decisions.

Sincerely,

Carol Spencer

1940 Ivywood Dr.