

January 6, 2025

TO: Matt Kowalski

Planning Commission Members

CC: Tim Loughrin

FROM: Emily Marlow, Country Place Condominium Association

Subject: Opposition to SP24-0007 – Conflict with City Policy and Comprehensive Plan

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I am writing to express my concerns about SP24-0007 and outline its apparent conflicts with established City policy and goals.

1. Zoning and Transit Corridor Concerns

The Unified Development Code designates R4E zoning for Transit Corridors. SP24-0007 is neither in nor near a Transit Corridor, making the application of R4E inappropriate.

2. Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map

Recently, the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee's Future Land Use Map for Ann Arbor designates our area (West of South Main and South of Scio Church Road) as Low-Rise Residential, stipulating neighborhood-scale buildings with a 35-foot height limit. This area allows townhouses with a maximum height of 35 feet and limits multifamily buildings to appropriate scales.

SP24-0007, with its 40-foot-tall buildings, starkly contradicts these guidelines.

3. Impact on Adjacent Property

The Unified Development Code mandates that site plans minimize impact on adjacent properties. Robertson's current proposal does not adequately address this, disregarding previous suggestions of 2-story buildings along shared property lines.

4. Transition Between Uses of Differing Intensities

Robertson's refusal to consider 2-story buildings, despite their suitability as demonstrated in other projects (e.g., Waters Rd. project with Hawthorne Ridge), undermines their claim of providing an appropriate transition between uses of differing intensities.

5. Roof Decks and Building Heights

Including roof decks on 40-foot-tall buildings further exacerbates the impact on surrounding properties. These should be reconsidered or eliminated to align with community standards and expectations.

6. Light and Shadow Impact

Given the City Council's ordinance on limiting nighttime light trespass, the shadow impact from 40-foot-tall buildings 20-30 feet from homes on Audubon Drive is concerning. These buildings block sunlight until late morning and constitute a year-round trespass of light.

Conclusion

Currently, SP24-0007 directly conflicts with the City's policy and comprehensive planning goals. The proposal should be rejected without substantial revisions that align with these frameworks.

Thank you for considering these points. We urge the Planning Commission to recommend against the current iteration of SP24-0007.

Sincerely,

Emily Marlow