To: Ann Arbor Planning Commission; Ann Arbor Planning Commission Members

CC: Tim Loughrin, Robertson Homes

From: Karen Benson, Country Place Condominium Association

RE: Scio Church Development Proposal SP24-0007

Summary of Concerns Regarding Robertson's R4E Zoning Application

1. **Inaccuracy of Transit Corridor Status:**
    a. Initial Assumption: The proposed development was believed to be in or near a transit corridor.
    b. Clarification: Documentation reveals that Robertson's site is not in a transit corridor.
    c. 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:**
    a. High-Density Requirement: Robertson claims their proposal meets the City's requirement for high density.
    b. Incompatibility: The area mainly consists of R2 and R1 single-family homes, and high density is deemed inappropriate.
    c. 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, making the structures 4 stories tall.
3. **Consistency with City Policies and Plans:**
    a. Planning Staff's Position: Staff claims that R4E zoning is consistent with City policies, even absent a transit corridor.
    b. Discrepancy with UDC: Such a designation contradicts the clear intent of the Unified Development Code.
    c. Neighborhood Impact: There is a concern that Robertson's plan will fail to minimize adverse effects on adjacent properties as required.

4. **Potential Aesthetic and Functional Issues:**
    a. Comparative Example: Concerns based on the appearance and density of the Robertson's Waters Road project.
    b. Perception: The development may resemble a crowded apartment complex.
5. **Suitability for Proposed Residents:**
    a. Target Demographics: Robertson aims to attract professionals, empty nesters, and students with 3-bedroom townhomes.
    b. Practicality: Questions arise about the appeal for empty nesters needing three bedrooms and potential use by students. The proposed residences are incompatible with an aging-in-place community.
    c. HOA Bylaws: Robertson has yet to confirm if specific rental restrictions, such as those applied to Waters Road, will be implemented for this development. Without similar restrictions, there is a concern that units will be purchased by investors for short time rental purposes given the proximity to University of Michigan athletic facilities.

In conclusion, the Planning Commission is urged to:

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

Yours truly,

Karen Benson