

From: Irvin A. Mermelstein
Sent: Saturday, July 11, 2015 3:33 PM
To: Planning; Kowalski, Matthew; Rampson, Wendy
Cc: Pat Marten; Kate; Bill Higgins; Frank Burdick; Prasad; Ruth Dixon; Jeff West; Carolyn Manz; Malini Raghavan; Bob Parnes; Susan Terrible; Ruth Gonzalez; Greg Hebert; Aram Kalousdian; Randy & Ronnalee Kent; Ed Stuenkel; Steve Kennel; Chuck Wilkins; William A. Pollard; Michael Williams; Steve Horler; Diane F. Reynolds; Eric Macks; John Neal; Judy Hanway; Charles Cowley; Michael Manz
Subject: 2250 Ann Arbor Saline Road

Dear Members of the Planning Commission and Planning Commission staff,

I reside, with my wife, son and daughter, at 2099 Ascot Rd., located within 300 yards of the proposed project at 2250 Ann Arbor-Saline Road. I received one of the very few cards that were mailed about the upcoming meeting on July 21. I oppose this project, first, because it would fundamentally change the character of my street. There is currently no access from or to Ann Arbor Saline Road, and there hasn't ever been.

This project, however, proposes to pierce an established subdivision by connecting Ascot Rd **directly to** Ann Arbor Saline Road via an access road to and from my street. The access road would be one half block from my home. Ascot Road would become Access Road.

The access road--from which the neighborhood is locked out--would make Ascot Rd an attractive short cut from or to Ann Arbor Saline Road, and from or to either Scio Church Rd or (via other streets, such as Lans Way and Delaware) from or to South Seventh St., including on game days.

The gate also strikes me as a fig leaf that is likely to malfunction or to be left open when the demand for ingress and egress through Ascot Road is heavy or when there is a great deal of snow on the ground or for a number of other reasons. The gates give the look of a private road to an intrusive public road, in my opinion.

I have expressed my views in earlier emails to the Commission and to Mr. Kowalski. I rarely speak at public hearings. I note for the record that other residents appear to receive responses or acknowledgements of their communications. Those from this household do not.

This raises a question about whom the Planning Commission and staff are listening to and whom they are not listening to and why.

For example, the following is the description of the eloquent comment made by Bob Parnes and included in the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting on December 2, 2014, a meeting between Thanksgiving and Christmas:

Robert Parnes, 2067 Ascot Road, Ann Arbor, read from a prepared statement, which was also submitted to the Commission. He expressed opposition to the cut through connection to Lambeth Drive and the added traffic. He said he understood that the cut through was not essential to the long-term success of the condo project, and the fire department says it's not essential since they have access. He said he believes the developer wants to give condo occupants convenient access to the north and west, through using their street, and being able to access Scio Church Road. He noted that when streets are used as cut throughs, it increases traffic and decreases safety and property values. He said he has tried to think of benefits from the cut through to the existing neighbors but can't think of any, and with the one-way security gate proposed, the neighbors won't be able to use the cut through to speed their connections going east and to Ann Arbor Saline Road. He said the benefits seem to be all for the developer, and he urged the Commission to deny the cut through to Lambeth.

His comment reflects the view of many who live in the neighborhood on the other side of the proposed gate. I am copying some of those neighbors and asking that they express their own views to you on whether they agree with Mr. Parnes. I encourage those who agree with Bob to cut and paste something from this email and send it to you with their own comments and expressions of agreement or disagreement.

For present purposes, though, could the staff explain how Mr Parnes's comment was reviewed by the Planning Commission and staff and how his comments are reflected in the developer's latest submission to the Commission on the cut-through? The developer's views seem to have been taken into account. The neighbors copied on this email will, I am sure, be interested in your response.

Irvin A. Mermelstein