

Our group met with the developers three times, twice in our house and once in Sloan Plaza. They listened to us, but they never offered any modification to their project that showed any consideration or respect for our stated concerns. They do not care about our important landmarks or the impact this project will have on three adjacent historic districts. They have been extremely uncooperative and unresponsive to citizen and staff input.

Opinions summarized in “SP12-036-6 citizens' comments,” pages 26 and 27 in your packet, from the **public input session** are not well-represented in the staff report. Every person who commented was very negative and in some way said that the building was too large or too massive for the location. The comment about the roadway changing at the intersection doesn't identify the real issue, which is that building to the lot line pushes the building into the line-of-sight driving east on Huron, rather keeping it in alignment with buildings extending from the Municipal and Justice Center east to Sloan Plaza and Campus Inn. This alignment should be respected, and a pedestrian walkway provided that continues the straight line.

My comment, that the building should be viewed in the round, addresses zoning and the overlay districts that are part of the draft ordinance, but have been ignored by developers and staff alike.

Section 5.10.4., Relationship of Base and Overlay Zoning Districts, says that if a property is included in an overlay district, then the regulations governing development in the overlay district shall apply in addition to the regulations governing development in the underlying base district. This project is in the East Huron 1 Overlay district.

The purpose of the overlay zoning districts is to supplement regulations for the D1 and D2 districts to reflect the diversity of historical and built environments within the downtown. The intent is to continue the tradition of free-standing Buildings with Open Space in front, incorporating design that includes signature building elements that give landmark qualities to properties.

- A 5-foot deep covered arcade with columns is not useable for walking or other public use.
- A 6-foot public sidewalk along E. Huron and N. Division is too narrow for pedestrian comfort and safety.

- Building to the lot line and minimum setback lines does not comply with “in the round” design, nor does this create useable public open space.

This aspect of the zoning ordinance is not quantified, and does not appear in your packet, but it is really important to the interpretation of the proposal and whether it complies with zoning, and whether it deserves to be given premiums. Clearly (to us) it does not. Staff has not explained how these premiums have been earned, and on what basis the full increase has been awarded. We ask for that accounting, and we ask that it be tied to items in the ordinance.

Premiums are defined in Section **5.18.7** as an increase in allowable Floor area to exceed the normal maximum Usable Floor area in percentage of lot area for Structures in **D1** and **D2** Zoning Districts. Are Premiums really “by right?” Language in 5.18.7 suggests otherwise, that they are negotiable and intended to be incentives and encouragements that result in real benefits to the city and its citizens.

Providing housing close to the business core is important, and worthy of being an incentive to earn premiums, but not when it is housing just for students. There are so many bad things about these floor plans, that I don’t know where to begin, and I don’t want to get bogged down in minutia, when the problems of inflexibility and creating a student ghetto are so glaringly obvious. Two small elevators at only one end of the tower, with the expectation that students will be bringing bikes up and down on a daily basis, is absurd.

Surface runoff and site drainage pose a serious threat to our property, particularly to the historic carriage house that sits close to the property line. The site slopes to the northwest, and runoff from the surface parking and rear paved area will drain into our backyard. The proposed topography needs to be changed to redirect drainage back onto the site, and the fence must be higher and more solid to prevent trespass through the lot.

Access to sunlight is a human need and personal right. I am concerned about my loss of sunlight. Being shaded is one thing, but having a massive solid masonry hulk blocking my view of the sky and preventing sunlight from reaching my house is devastating, especially in winter, when we rely on the warmth of the sun to reduce our utility bills. They say they are designing to meet LEED Guidelines, while my house has inherently green features that rely on the sun, and my rights are being denied by the greed of this developer.