

**Attachments:**

Robertson Objection.docx

---

**From:** Karen DeLoss

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 28, 2024 9:48 AM

**To:** Lenart, Brett <BLenart@a2gov.org>; Kelley, Hank <HKelley@a2gov.org>; DiLeo, Alexis <ADiLeo@a2gov.org>; Kowalski, Matthew <MKowalski@a2gov.org>; Melin-Corcoran, Mariana <MMelin-Corcoran@a2gov.org>; Thacher, Jill <JThacher@a2gov.org>; Barrett, Jon <JBarrett@a2gov.org>; Manor, Courtney <CManor@a2gov.org>

**Subject:**

Good morning everyone,

Please see attachment regarding Robertson's R4E zoning application. I recognize there is a concern for housing but we also need to balance out aesthetics and need for homes rather than a city of condos. I appreciate all of your hard work and acknowledge there are challenges and struggles.

My husband and I really appreciate your consideration in advance.

Kindly,

Karen DeLoss and Siamak Moshiri

2003 Audubon Dr

Ann Arbor, 48103

Ward 4

To: Ann Arbor Planning Commission  
Ann Arbor Planning Commission Members  
CC: Tim Loughrin, Robertson Homes  
From: Mr. and Mrs. Siamak Moshiri  
RE: Scio Church Development Proposal SP24-0007

## **Summary of Concerns Regarding Robertson's R4E Zoning Application**

### **1. Inaccuracy of Transit Corridor Status:**

- Initial Assumption: The proposed development was believed to be in or near a transit corridor.
- Clarification: Documentation reveals that Robertson's site is not in a transit corridor.
- Code Compliance: The Unified Development Code (UDC) specifies that R4E zoning is for parcels along signature transit corridors, which this land is not.

### **2. Density and Compatibility with Surroundings:**

- High-Density Requirement: Robertson claims their proposal meets the City's requirement for high density.

Incompatibility: The area mainly consists of R2 and R1 single-family homes, and the high density is deemed inappropriate.

Robertson's Intent: It is suggested that the R4E zoning be sought to allow the construction of 35—or 40-foot-tall townhomes, fitting 75 homes on approximately 5 acres with roof-top patios.

### **3. Consistency with City Policies and Plans:**

- Planning Staff's Position: Staff claims that R4E zoning is consistent with City policies, even absent a transit corridor.
- Discrepancy with UDC: Such a designation contradicts the clear intent of the Unified Development Code.
- Neighborhood Impact: There is concern that Robertson's plan needs to minimize adverse effects on adjacent properties.

### **4. Potential Aesthetic and Functional Issues:**

- Comparative Example: Concerns based on the appearance and density of the Robertson's Waters Road project.
- Perception: The development may resemble a crowded apartment complex.

### **5. Suitability for Proposed Residents:**

- Target Demographics: Robertson aims to attract professionals, empty nesters, and students with 3-bedroom townhomes.
- Practicality: Questions arise about the appeal for empty nesters needing three bedrooms and potential use by students.
- HOA Bylaws: Robertson has yet to confirm if specific rental restrictions, such as those applied to Waters Road, will be implemented for this development.

In conclusion, the Planning Commission is urged to:

- Reevaluate Robertson's R4E zoning application, the inconsistencies with UDC, and the absence of a transit corridor.
- Address Neighborhood Compatibility: Assess the high-density proposal's fit with the surrounding single-family residential zone.
- Consider Resident Concerns: Consider the opinions and expectations of longstanding community members and seek substantial modifications to the proposal before approval.

Kindly,

Karen DeLoss Moshiri, OD

Siamak Moshiri