

From: Priscilla Cheever <cheeverp68@gmail.com>

Date: Wed, Aug 29, 2018, 2:53 PM

Subject: LOCKWOOD REZONING PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA FOR SEPT 5, 2018

To: <MKoslowski@a2gov.org>

Cc: <BLenart@a2gov.org>, <Planning@a2gov.org>, Chip Smith <ChSmith@a2gov.org>, Chuck Warpehoski <CWarpehoski@a2gov.org>, Eaton, Jack <jeaton@a2gov.org>, beth collins <rdhbeth@gmail.com>, Philip McMillion <philmcmill@yahoo.com>

Mr. Koslowski:

I am writing in opposition to the proposed Lockwood rezoning set once again for the Planning Commission agenda. I must say I am very disappointed that you rejected many proposed dates for Beth Collins, Phil and me to meet with you over the last two months. You kept stating that staff had not had time to review new materials, but then suddenly staff approved the single change and you became available to discuss. This is not citizen input to staff decisions. We have a number of specific concerns which you have not addressed.

At the May Planning Commission meeting many neighbors spoke in opposition to this rezoning and the Commission members also raised a number of concerns before the rezoning was tabled and referred back to city staff for further consideration. The new version addresses none of them.

I oppose this project because the City's own Master Plan designates this parcel as single family residential. It is bounded by Lakewood Sub, Westover sub, and Dolph Park itself. Lakewood and Westover are all single family homes. City staff keep stating that the Master Plan is "old" and may be revised. But it is the Master Plan on the books now. If I raced down City streets and told a cop who pulled me over that "someday" the speed limits might be revised to allow higher speeds, that cop would laugh as I got a ticket.

Residents of Westover and Lakewood chose to live in family neighborhoods. If we had wanted to live in a mixed use commercial area, we would be living elsewhere. This proposal plunks a massive commercial apartment building down in the middle of our neighborhoods and Dolph Park. Dressing it up as "senior housing" does not change the nature of the commercial building massively out of scale with our neighborhood. Nor does adding in a few studio apartments to wave the magic "affordable housing" flag change anything. Our houses are affordable housing for families. The zoning should remain single family.

Nor have you seriously considered that this project would be atop a critical monitoring well (and three others less critical) for the dioxane plume. Originally Lockwood proposed to simply eliminate the monitoring well entirely. Now they plan to put it in a basement. Roger Rayle spoke extensively at the May Planning Commission about the risks to the City water supply to paving over three acres, installing a single stream stormwater drainage system, and the excavation necessary for what is a four story building, counting the peaked roof. The DNR has never protected the citizens of Ann Arbor and Scio Township and will not do so now. They have historically done the minimum cost/hassle for Gelman and its successors in the clean up. Decades later the contamination continues to spread. A quite large rain garden project in

Lakewood sub very near this area has already gone in and its effect on stormwater drainage and the plume has not been considered by City staff in connection with the Lockwood project as far as is known to us.

As noted in May, this 90 plus unit commercial building offers a meal plan (\$500) on top of the \$2000-\$3000 rent. Three meals a day for more than 100 residents will result in many idling semi trucks right on top of our houses unloading daily. Commercial dumpsters were originally planned right next to a house. Now they they have moved 15 feet. This does not solve the problem. In addition, this is senior housing. Any resident requiring assistance with activities of daily living or with medical needs will be required to hire outside providers. This means more cars funneling into the project. Since it will be across from Weber's and just down from the I-94 exit ramp, all this extra traffic will not be easily moving in and out onto Jackson Road. Overflow parking will impact the neighborhood streets. A traffic study discussed in May has not been done, so far as we know.

The impact on Dolph Park and the Sister Lake (a unique glacial lake) will be negative. Dolph is heavily used by residents and birders who come from many areas of the City. Many people assumed the 3 acres Lockwood would build on to have been part of the Park, since it is contiguous with the Park and vacant. Very little consideration has been given to the best use of this land which we understand is the original epicenter of the dioxane plume.

I will attend the Planning Commission meeting, as will other neighbors. We are disappointed that this quite unnecessary rezoning request is still going forward.

Priscilla Cheever
267 S. Wagner, Ann Arbor, 48103

Lenart, Brett

From: Mark Sabor <sabor777@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 22, 2018 12:59 PM
To: Lenart, Brett; Lumm, Jane
Subject: Rainbow Childcare

Dear Mr Lenart,

I attended the planning commission meeting last night concerning the Rainbow Child Care plan. I live directly across the street from Claugue at the corner of Shefman and Bluett.

There are some discussion last night with the planning commission about encouraging the AAPS and Rainbow to work together on the entrances. The implied point was that some commissioners want to see the east entrance reopened to alleviate traffic at the Claugue/Nixon intersection. The problem with this is it will push Rainbow traffic through Claugue parking area out onto Bluett where these drivers will head west on Bluett to make a left onto southbound Nixon. The existing traffic study (without all the new approved development) already shows that that intersection has an LOC of "E" and "F". Opening the east entrance will just make this worse. All you would be doing is pushing the left-turn traffic from Claugue/Nixon intersection to the Bluett/Nixon intersection.

One of the keys to the traffic issues for this project is that due to its location, this project will require a lot of left turns in heavy traffic. This is something that all the neighbors are keenly aware that I am not sure the commissioners are.

Lastly, Commissioner Ackerman pointed out last night that the Nixon improvement project was in its infancy; meaning no timeline and no funding. Unless something changes on that plan, the commission cannot count on that to solve these traffic problems.

Regards,

Mark Sabor

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

Lenart, Brett

From: beth collins <rdhbeth@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 27, 2018 8:05 AM
To: Planning
Subject: for the PROPOSED Lockwood packet PC Sept 5th, 2018
Attachments: Screen Shot 2018-08-26 at 6.23.45 AM.png; Concerned Citizens - June 2018.pdf; brownfield_infiltration_decision_tool.pdf

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I hope you will read our neighborhood concerns for the Proposed Re-Zone of the Single Family parcel on 3365 Jackson Rd.

I have them attached as well as a form from the EPA about stormwater infiltration systems NOT recommended over contaminated groundwater. Please read pg. 6-7 and the flow chart on pg 13.

We DO NOT care if City Staff and Lockwood's engineers say that their Stormwater Infiltration Bioswales are OK to place on this site. We remember when everyone said Gelman dumping the dioxane was OK. **They were wrong.** The DNR and EPA let them pollute our groundwater for years after it was discovered and a known carcinogen. Gelman was then allowed to continue to push dioxane down into a deep well for years after the clean-up of shallow groundwater was taking place.

I have more information about Stormwater Infiltrations raising the water table, which could flood our basements with dioxane and push it to the surface like it did when Pall tried to infiltrate the dioxane from Porter Rd (my street) to Evergreen and back. We had street flooding with 1,4-dioxane coming to the surface.

This is unacceptable. We, as a city, must tread lightly over the contamination. There are too many unknowns.

There are so many other problems with this Single Family lot being rezoned to commercial / multi family residential.

Attached is a screen shot from 1995 about overdevelopment harming the precious, glacier made First Sister Lake. Our tax dollars were just spent on a \$500,000 rain garden from normal street and home run off. This large clear-cutting operation MUST not be done on this parcel of land.

This is AnnArbor, with all the greatness of trees, green space and parks. We value our natural resources and do not want to ruin this lake and bird migration destination for our grandchildren's generation so that you can get your quota of affordable units in this year. We are all for building affordable units, but NOT this way. Not a high-rise, clear cutting operation on a small single family lot, while pushing the dioxane plume faster in unknown directions.

Please consider these concerns from the residents, and read the many, many others. Many which **you all** were concerned about on May 1st at the initial Planning Commission meeting.

Thank you so much for your time and consideration, and your service to our city,
Sincerely,

Beth Collins
Sister Lakes Neighborhood Representative



Implementing Stormwater Infiltration Practices at Vacant Parcels and Brownfield Sites

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Water
Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response

Introduction

This document presents information to assist communities, developers, and other stakeholders in determining the appropriateness of implementing stormwater management practices that promote infiltration at vacant parcels and brownfield sites.

A brownfield is a property where redevelopment or reuse may be complicated by the presence (or likely presence) of contamination. Vacant parcels may also be brownfield sites depending upon their prior use. Redevelopment of brownfield properties is often conducted using approaches that are specifically designed to reduce or eliminate the human and ecological health risks associated with these substances. Common risks associated with brownfield sites include:

Risk To...	Resulting From...
Human health	Direct contact, inhalation, or ingestion
Groundwater	Leaching of a contaminant(s)
Nearby surface waters or ecosystems	Runoff from the site which has picked up contaminants due to leaching or erosion

Strategies for reducing or eliminating these risks can include removing contaminated soil or waste materials, treating soils on site, placing a cap or barrier over contaminated areas, bioremediation, or monitored natural attenuation.

Many urban and suburban communities are required to develop municipal stormwater management programs to control the discharge of pollutants from their separate stormwater and sewer systems. These municipal stormwater programs typically require new development and redevelopment projects to implement best management practices (BMPs) that reduce pollutant discharges and control stormwater runoff. The specific requirements for each stormwater program can vary, but many programs require or encourage development projects to address stormwater runoff through controls that either infiltrate stormwater prior to its runoff from a property or provide for the detention and treatment of the stormwater before it is discharged.

Communities seeking to implement sustainable stormwater management frequently use rain gardens, bioswales, permeable pavement and other practices, often referred to as *green infrastructure*, to manage runoff. These stormwater infiltration practices often allow accumulated runoff water to percolate into the subsoil which reduces stormwater runoff. Projects that infiltrate stormwater runoff on-site can provide multiple benefits, including decreased stormwater infrastructure costs, increased groundwater recharge, and decreased pollutant loads in stormwater runoff.

Vacant or under-utilized parcels may appear to be promising places to locate stormwater infiltration practices. However, it is important to reconcile the goal of sustainably managing stormwater with brownfield site considerations. Infiltrating stormwater at sites where there are contaminants present may mobilize the contaminants and increase the potential for groundwater contamination.