

Thursday, November 16, 2017 – Ann Arbor Senior Center

- Maybe acceptable for large lots in certain neighborhoods but not in Burns Park
- Represents an inequality in how neighborhoods will be affected
- Solar structure will ruin uniform residential look
- Terrible solution
- Nobody listens to us, Council does whatever they want, and so does PC.
- City did not ask the residents what they want
- No other Cities allow in the front open space, why is Ann Arbor forcing this upon residents?
- This will have huge impact on property values
- Might be appropriate in some neighborhoods, but not Burns Park.
- Their houses have high value and this would destroy the investment
- Why does the PC have so much power to decide what is best, they do not represent the people
- Does it even provide enough power to be a reasonable solution?
- Impact as a whole to the entire community
- This proposal will not protect public health and safety
- Cant believe she has to even attend this meeting
- Ridiculous
- Why on earth would they even be allowed in the City of Ann Arbor
- Seriously flawed proposal
- Solar should be subsidized not taxed extra
- Why will taxes go up? Creates a disincentive
- The City should add subsidies
- What are the economic impacts?
- Concerned with aesthetics
- Need aesthetic values
- This does not reflect the sentiment of the people
- Planning Commission lectures other people
- There is no credible agreement for this proposal
- Why is no fencing required, it should be.
- Appalled at Planning Commission action
- Makes more sense to have on the roof of buildings
- City should give subsidy
- The city should give a rebate on solar installation you would get more solar than just allowing it in the front yard.
- Detracts from neighborhood character
- It is common sense not to allow in front yards
- Perform a cost/benefit analysis
- This is a serious problem for the City of Ann Arbor
- Should be tax benefits
- City should focus on infrastructure improvements

- Should not be in the front open space
- 21 feet in height for accessory buildings is shocking
- Mind boggling that we have to be here

Tuesday, November 28, 2017 – AA Public Library Westgate Branch –

- Why not more coverage in the front yard, 100%
- No screening Landscaping should be required
- Define where exactly landscaping needs to go.
- More restrictive than existing, the draft is too restrictive
- Strange discussion to even be having, why wouldn't we allow this anywhere
- This could decrease property values on adjacent properties
- Are there any studies that show it will decrease property values?
- We want more solar, no effect on property value
- Right now there is a whole range of things allowed (in front open space)
- Restrictions are than acceptable to improve neighborhoods
- Climate change is real, time to put money where the mouth is. Ann Arbor is supposed to be a progressive City.
- Climate Change is priority, falls in line with City goals
- Why is the ordinance so restrictive?
- Either we(City of Ann Arbor) are in or out for climate change
- 35% of coverage in front yard, too restrictive
- Opposition is only aesthetic, can do aesthetically pleasing panels
- Solar panels could add value to properties
- Technology is only getting better.
- Is there any evidence that the panels are unsafe?
- Could allow it to go higher in backyard
- This ordinance takes a step back
- Accessory structures is a messed up ordinance
- Only 2 of 45 cities allow this, why would Ann Arbor?
- Very sensitive public issue
- Impact is significant on neighbors with no measurable benefits
- This seems like an appropriate response to the soar issue.
- City should look at Tax assessors impact
- This ordinance feels cobbled together, effects may be worse in the long run. Need a more comprehensive solar study/ordinance
- We should protect the few people that can do this.
- Too hideous to not allow this
- Feels to restrictive
- City should do more major projects, conglomerate
- PUD incentives should include solar

- Make this part of a larger climate/solar action plan.
- Lessen the tax burden of these improvements
- Mandate solar installation on all public buildings
- Look at the bigger picture
- Why write a code that affects so few properties?
- What about the worst-case scenario?
- Put solar in the industrial park
- Require warning signs for danger items

Thursday, November 30, 2017 – Clague Middle School

- Area most impacted is the Second Ward.
- What about Townhomes/Multiple-Family?
- What is the number of parcels affected
- Calculate percentage of City of affected
- This will cause blight in our City of Ann Arbor
- Blight in neighborhoods
- Should pass materials ordinance like in the downtown
- Affects quality of experience in our neighborhoods
- Extraordinary impact
- Fewer than 5 cities allow this in the country, includes a range of progressive cities
- City needs coherent strategy
- This policy is divisive among neighbors
- Most panels in the City are roof mounted
- Support solar, but not ground mounted
- Drive down Brockman, ground mounted solar not for there
- Opening door for blight in Burns Park
- Doesn't protect character in neighborhoods
- Arizona solar company rules indicate warnings about solar panel installation, servicing warnings
- Children are curious can be impact to their safety. Kids grab wires.
- Safety issues, panels get very hot
- Panels should be fenced like swimming pools, don't wait for a tragedy to occur
- How many deaths have to occur before City will do something?
- City making major statement, but it affects so few people.
- Either all in for solar or not
- Equal opportunity, only wealthy people will benefit from this
- Homeowner insurance, what effect? Will insurance even insure owners?
- City will be liable for all injuries/deaths.
- Backyards should be fenced if solar panels are allowed