From: Betsy Davis Sent: Friday, February 24, 2017 7:15 AM To: Planning <<u>Planning@a2gov.org</u>> Cc: Betsy Davis Subject: support for alternative plan for Circle K

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I live at 1421 Iroquois Place, directly behind the proposed Circle K redevelopment at the intersection of Stadium and Packard. I am writing to express my strong preference for Quatro Construction's "alternative plan" that was proposed at a neighborhood meeting held at Morgan and York on Wednesday, February 22. The alternative plan, while certainly imperfect, is a much better option, in my opinion, than the by-right plan that is on the agenda for the March 7 Planning Commission meeting.

The by-right plan pushes all of the activity--including traffic, noise, and light--of the gas station to the south, toward the residences. It presents a blind corner onto Packard that might be acceptable for vehicular traffic but worries me a great deal when I consider all of the children who walk to Burns Park or Tappan from our street; I don't feel that I'm overstating it to say that pedestrian lives seem at risk with this plan. Finally, while the modifications made since last fall slightly improve the building's engagement with the neighborhood, it still seems exceptionally disrespectful of the neighborhood in which it is placed.

The alternative plan has fewer flaws, and given the (many) alternatives we've seen, seems to address several of the concerns we've raised over time. Safety is paramount for us, and this plan at least allows clear sight lines for pedestrians and vehicles at the station and on and along Packard. Furthermore, the activity is rightly moved back toward Stadium, where it belongs, and the building would block the light from the canopy from two of the adjacent homes (though not my own). Traffic, noise, and light all move further from the residences with the alternative plan. It also is somewhat more in keeping with the neighborhood. While the alternative plan does require a variance, because the building is built into the setback, it still seems a more sensible design for the lot. As an affected homeowner, I am willing to trade the zoning variance for the overall advantages the alternative plan offers.

We understand that the developers would work to incorporate evergreens into the landscaping plan, to try to (eventually) mitigate the light from the canopy. We also understand that there would be a sound-dampening wall that would help to block both sound and light pollution from reaching the residences, as well as shields on the standalone lights to help mitigate light pollution toward the residences.

We would hope to see additional mitigation efforts made, including potentially:

- shrinking the overall size of the canopy by including only three pumps (as is the case in the by-right plan) rather than four pumps -- ideally by shrinking the portion toward the west end, to help reduce the light visible from the residences situated beyond the building

- limiting or eliminating the audio from the pumps (e.g., news, advertisements)

- incorporating cameras and lighting in the small space in between the wall and the back of the building, to discourage loiterers

- requesting a sound-dampening pad on the dumpster

- moving forward with as mature trees as possible, to improve the light and sound mitigation as quickly as possible
- using softer (not bright white) lighting
- including signage for pedestrian safety
- any other mitigation efforts that could be put in place

I also would like to express my sincere appreciation to the members of the Ann Arbor Planning Department as well as to Todd Quatro and Rianna Szatkowski of Quatro Construction. This has been a challenging process for all of us, and I appreciate all participants' good-faith efforts at trying to establish a plan that could work for all stakeholders.

Best wishes, Elizabeth Davis

Elizabeth A. Davis Professor, Science Education EMST unit coordinator 4107 School of Education University of Michigan betsyd@umich.edu