

From: William Higgins
Sent: Sunday, September 06, 2015 6:07 PM
To: Kowalski, Matthew
Subject: Fwd: 2250 Wetland Use Permit

Matt- I neglected to add your name; the second attachment requires a complete review of the surface water situation, inasmuch as the planned Detention does not rectify all surface water, especially that flowing down Ascot and part of Chaucer, thru Lamberth, and onto 2250 and below 2250. This is also for the Planning Commission.
William Higgins

Begin forwarded message:

From: William Higgins <whiggins27@gmail.com>
Date: September 6, 2015 at 7:55:31 AM EDT
To: sbriere@a2gov.org
Cc: woodsjl@cdmsmith.com
Subject: Fwd: 2250 Wetland Use Permit

This letter was written because Matt announced the subject matter for the Sept. 9 agenda- -which does not contain the many important "work assignments" from that meeting, so it is a new discovery for us, and I now call it to your attention because I do not know of a way to instigate a public discussion or call the details to the attention of the Commission.

William Higgins

Begin forwarded message:

From: William Higgins <whiggins27@gmail.com>
Date: September 5, 2015 at 9:30:28 AM EDT
To: Timmer Ken <ktimmer@comcast.net>
Cc: HANWAY JUDITH <judithhanway@sbcglobal.net>, Mermelstein Irvin <nrglaw@gmail.com>, Burdick Frank <fburdick1@aol.com>
Subject: 2250 Wetland Use Permit

I see where this item will be included on the upcoming Planning meeting.

As you may know, the water which flows to the 900' low point just below Village Oaks originates in part on the Pioneer property and is part of the Lansdowne service road water problem, as well as Maya/Audubon, properties behind Ascot/Lambeth, and most of the properties fronting on S.Main/Ann Arbor-Saline north of 2250 and including 2240.

This drainage has combined responsibilities- County, City, and Township (when water does not drain from the Pittsfield parcels fronting Scio Church Road, e.g. just west of the "beehives", the County is obligated to pump them dry...). And, in my communications with Evan Pratt, they had deferred approval of the 2250 detention and wetland rearrangement "plan" because of their responsibility with the capacity of Malletts Creek, who installed a large detention

facility (Mary Beth) downstream, and may eventually have to do more in Cranbrook Park, where two small detentions on private property now exist.

There are many small wetland areas in the 2250 slope feeding Malletts, and the primary reason for upstream flooding is that the normal and natural exit for this runoff is just south of Chaucer Court, which was an open stream before A2-Saline was filled and elevated. (after all, the natural course of this water was at ground level, which is now an east-west conduit below the roadway. (thus, Malletts was covered-up, just as it was in Lansdowne/Churchill east of Seventh). So we have man-made capacity limitations; the proposed detention does not solve all run-off problems thru 2250 because the "low point" receives runoff from other than the "2250" slope.

I may not be completely correct in the above, but I do know the minimal "fixes" (several recent street drains, an earlier 12" auxiliary drain, pumping at the low spot, substitution of crawl spaces for full basements, etc) plus an upstream detention on 2250- are probably inadequate.

It seems to me that this is another reason to defer 2250 and, in fact, request the County to provide a comprehensive review of all the "2250" and adjacent surface water issues. Mine have never been addressed since we moved in here. (1966)

I realize that some of us, like me, prefer to communicate with individuals and some of us will be "left out" in the process. Perhaps there is a fix because we need a larger group interest. Hope this helps.

William Higgins 2131 Chaucer (home of a perpetually wet back yard)