

March 25, 2024

To: Tim Loughrin, Robertson Homes

From: Tim Carroll, Country Place Condo Ass'n

RE: Scio Church Proposal

At the outset, we do not oppose development of the parcel you described and which we discussed during the mandatory Resident Participation Meeting held via Zoom on February 22nd. The property is truly beautiful and, although we have enjoyed the peace and quiet and wildlife for many years, it's probably time. However, we strongly object to some parts of the Robertson proposal and want those objections to be part of the record going forward.

First, Density. Seventy five homes shoe horned onto this land is entirely unreasonable. If we disregard the wetland area on the southwest corner and the retention pond, are we left with just 5 acres or so?

We do not need 150 automobiles in this tight area, coming and going 365 days a year. Now, at least, most will be gasoline or diesel powered, blowing far more exhaust into the air than all the gas powered leaf blowers the City just outlawed. The traffic problems should be obvious, especially when you factor in the 450 apartments Ann Arbor approved for the Valhalla site and all the automobiles of the apartment dwellers which will flow onto South Main every day.

With Valhalla we have all the density we need and /or can handle in the Scio Church – South Main area. We must object to your high density proposal for this reason alone.

R4E Zoning and 3 Story Buildings. These buildings are probably more than 40 feet tall and will actually block out the sun for most of the

morning. Your site plan has them stacked all along the border with Country Place on Audubon Drive, within 25 or 30 feet of some of our homes. Forty plus foot, three story buildings are entirely in conflict with EVERY residential area on Scio Church Road from South Main Street to the City limits on the west. Obviously, we object.

As I understand the rules, zoning after annexation should be based upon City Master Plan for the surrounding area and upon present land uses. Additionally, I believe the United Development Code requires an R4E site design to minimize the adverse impact upon the adjacent property. Your site plan simply does not comply.

During the Zoom meeting you suggested that Robertson may be open to design change, and I am aware of the two story buildings being erected on Waters Road at Townes on the Green, all along its western border. You could develop the Scio Church property with two story buildings, R3 zoning and achieve moderate density without the serious adverse impact upon the adjacent property owners that your present plan involves.

Other Concerns. Whatever is eventually presented to the Planning Commission and City Council, it must include a decent barrier, separating the project from Audubon Drive, not just a few trees . Additionally, the lighting must not be intrusive. No "light trespass " as the City named it in the ordinance limiting Christmas decorations to certain months and certain hours. I believe you agreed on both of these issues during our Zoom meeting of February 22d.

May 6, 2024

To: Matthew Kowalski, Ann Arbor Planning Commission

Ann Arbor Planning Commission Members

CC: Tim Loughrin, Robertson Homes

From: Tim Carroll. Country Place Condominium Association

RE: Scio Church Development Proposal SP24-0007

Attached is a copy of our March 25 memo to Mr. Loughrin of Robertson Homes outlining our concerns and our objections to the Robertson Homes proposal for the Scio Church Road development. In response to this memo, Mr. Loughrin stated that the twelve three story buildings in the plan are consistent with the Master Plan and are required to satisfy the City's insistence on high density.

Although the Master Plan for the area contemplates attached single family homes, its language was certainly not intended to permit three story buildings about 40 feet high, plus optional rooftop decks, with as many as eight homes in each building.

The City Zoning Ordinance specifically requires that all new developments proposed to be zoned R4E be **consistent with existing adjacent land uses such that the impact on the community is minimized**. The adjacent land, on BOTH sides of Robertson's ultra high density project is zoned R2 . We have two family, two story, attached condominiums on Audubon Drive to the west . The R2 parcel on the east is vacant. In essence, Robertson is asking for R4E zoning in the center of an R2 area. These three story buildings proposed for this project, which will tower over the neighboring two story homes, are entirely inconsistent with existing adjacent land uses. This is especially true of any of those new homes where buyers have opted for rooftop decks, essentially adding a fourth floor.

The question is not whether high density (building as many homes on as little property as possible) is wise or unwise.

The only real question is quite simple. Is THIS proposal, with twelve huge buildings, some including roof decks, appropriate for THIS parcel? THE ANSWER IS CLEARLY NO!

R4E Zoning

Quite apart from the reasons outlined above, Robertson's request for R4E zoning and its plan for seventy five homes on approximately five acres, in twelve multi-family, extremely tall buildings, should be rejected for failure to meet the basic requirements of the applicable Ordinance:

The elements of land use planning and site design should ensure that the impact of such intensity of land use on the adjacent property and the community as a whole is minimized.” Sec 5.11 7 B 4 Unified Development Code.

We have seen little or no effort by Robertson to comply with this language. Even after the Zoom meeting and both telephonic and written communication, it appears that Robertson has not really budged. Nothing has been done to “minimize the impact” on Country Place or other nearby residential areas.

To comply with the Unified Development Code, modifications to the site plan are absolutely mandatory. Some seem simple and obvious. Three of these forty foot buildings are only thirty feet or so from our homes on Audubon Drive. Instead of these huge structures, Robertson could build two story condos along the property line, as they have done at their Waters Road project along the boundary with Hawthorn Ridge. While Pittsfield Township may not face the same housing issues as Ann Arbor, the Waters Road project clearly shows that Robertson Homes knows how to build beautiful two story homes and that they can do so without materially affecting density.

Robertson could also move the larger three story buildings further from the west edge of the property by eliminating a half dozen or so condos from the west edge of these buildings. The development would still satisfy any reasonable density requirement.

We ask that the Planning Commission give full recognition to the legitimate concerns and reasonable expectations of Audubon Drive and other nearby home owners, who have been paying Ann Arbor taxes for many years. In the absence of substantial modifications, we urge you to recommend rejection of the Robertson proposal.