

-----Original Message-----

From: Ken Timmer [<mailto:ktimmer@comcast.net>]

Sent: Sunday, August 23, 2015 3:18 PM

To: William Higgins; Kowalski, Matthew; Rampson, Wendy; [wwoods@umich.edu](mailto:wwoods@umich.edu)

Cc: Briere, Sabra; Planning; Powers, Steve; Eaton, Jack; Krapohl, Graydon; Judith Hanway; Rob Dixon

Subject: Re: Modifications to the 2250 Plan

I fully agree, support and endorse Bill's comments.

I would ask the commission to step back and consider this development in basic terms. The proposal is for an R4 development adjacent to an R1 established neighborhood. The commission's desire should be how to have these two coexist with the minimum of interference with each other, and respecting the rights of both the developer and the longstanding homeowners. Any reasonable consideration of this results in concluding that the two (development and neighborhood) should remain separate and distinct. And since all the furor over the Lambeth access road/walk (whatever you want to call it) is based on a flimsy assumption of emergency use during football games, and is NOT required by code (how often have I had to say that), simply removing any access to Lambeth and having the development maximize the entrance (with perhaps two) to AA-Saline Rd is the obvious solution. WHY is such a simple solution so difficult for the commission to come to?

The 20 ft wide "concourse" proposed in the latest revision is absolutely ludicrous and ridiculous. PLEASE bring this issue back to where common sense is being used, reject this latest proposal and eliminate all access to Lambeth.

Kenneth Timmer  
2112 Ascot Rd

Sent from my iPad

> On Aug 23, 2015, at 2:00 PM, William Higgins <[whiggins27@gmail.com](mailto:whiggins27@gmail.com)> wrote:

>  
> Sabra- on September 9 you will see that none of the problems related  
> to the subject Apartment Complex will be addressed and the disputed  
> west entrance will still contain a complete/full width public type  
> road including dual sidewalks- from the stub  
> road (Lambeth). My review of the plan shows not only the removal  
> of 176 trees, but a complete elimination of all vegetation on the site  
> due to the amount of earth relocation, zero provision for a buffer  
> zone, the lack of co-ordination with adjacent businesses and  
> dwellings, the lack of detail for surface water handling, the safety  
> aspects of the unprotected detention, the inadequate setbacks, the  
> over-paving and excess parking, the minimalist sizing of the principal  
> entry/exiting on Ann Arbor-Saline Road, or the traffic issues related  
> to pedestrian crossings, and many other issues.  
> We have been promised responses from Planning which have not occurred.  
> We have proposed a Fire Lane solution which provides a second  
> "North-South" access which resolves a Fire Marshall concern for  
> Brookdale assisted living immediately to the north.  
> It is quite obvious that the City believes a 50 year old surface  
> water problem will be resolved in exchange for the developer to use an  
> established neighborhood to accept traffic from 150 or more vehicles  
> eventually entering and exiting from 2250 onto a labyrinthine 60 year  
> old residential area. Perhaps you recall the never-ending City  
> problem of the Iroquois short cut (south west corner of Stadium and  
> Packard) - speed bumps, gates, signs, etc).  
> I am sure this problem exists in other areas of the City. We are not  
> against some business usage for even Township properties annexed and  
> re-zoned or otherwise. But we must preserve the integrity of

- > neighborhoods in spite of a rush for increased tax base (which has
- > seldom worked long term in my observations here since 1966).
- > I urge you and the other Committee members to reject the Sept. 9
- > 2250 Plan until all out concerns are addressed. (we are not allowed to
- > communicate with them, per Commission edict).
- > William Higgins
- >