

From: [CityClerk](#)
To: [*City Council Members \(All\)](#); [Alexa, Jennifer](#); [Beattie, Kelly](#); [Beaudry, Jacqueline](#); [ConfRoom - Guest Services](#); [Crawford, Tom](#); [CTN](#); [Delacourt, Derek](#); [Fournier, John](#); [Gerhart, Stephen](#); [Harris, David](#); [Higgins, Sara](#); [McDonald, Gregory](#); [McDonald, Kevin](#); [Michailuk, Greg](#); [Orcutt, Wendy](#); [Postema, Stephen](#); [Satterlee, Joanna](#); [Schopieray, Christine](#); [Wondrash, Lisa](#)
Subject: FW: 3395 Jackson Ave Ann Arbor Michigan
Date: Monday, May 18, 2020 9:50:46 AM

Office of the Ann Arbor City Clerk
301 E. Huron Street
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
734.794.6140 (O)
734.994.8296 (Fax)
cityclerk@a2gov.org

From: chenqixing321 <chenqixing321@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 17, 2020 11:57 AM
To: CityClerk <CityClerk@a2gov.org>
Subject: 3395 Jackson Ave Ann Arbor Michigan

This message was sent from outside of the City of Ann Arbor. Please do not click links, open attachments, or follow directions unless you recognize the source of this email and know the content is safe.

Dear City Council Members,

I am writing to you on behalf of 4 of the 5 property owners directly affected by the proposed Jackson Rd Sidewalk Gap Elimination project. As one voice, we would like to raise our objections to this project on several fronts.

None of us feel the sidewalk project conveys any benefit to us or our properties

We feel that the project places an unfair financial burden on the 5 properties.

If the city has determined that the sidewalk project is a necessity for the public benefit and/or pedestrian safety then the majority of burden of the cost should at the very least be shared by the city.

The Powerpoint presentation from the Mar 12, 2020 meeting on the SIDEWALK GAP INFORMATION AND FACTS slide states "Initial prioritization Effort:

Combined into budget for Pedestrian Safety and Access Task Force". The letter from Mr. Nearing summarizing the Mar. 12 meeting notes that the City Council was going to consider reallocation of city funds "as a way of helping defray some of the project's expenses while still working towards the

City's goal of creating a Complete Street network that provides many different means of transportation and recreational opportunities for all residents."

From this it is clear that this is a project on the City's agenda for the benefit of the general public (and not at the request of the citizens being asked carry the expense of the project). And it is clear that the city recognized that it should bear some of that burden.

It is concerning that 7 of the 11 council members did not see fit to defray any of the financial burden from the small group of us.

In addition to the immediate financial burden this places on us, it now creates a new obligation and burden, that of snow and ice removal. This is particularly burdensome to the owners of the vacant lot, who do not reside on the property (nor in the state).

The financial burden is significant (even with the interest bearing deferred payments) to all the property owners. The assessments range from \$8418 to \$51,975! Several of the property owners will not be able to afford unanticipated assessment of this magnitude. Many are worried they will lose their homes/property over a sidewalk they have no interest in. What a tragedy that would be for one or more owners to lose their property for a sidewalk that the city wants simply to complete its goal of a "Complete Street network...to provide recreational opportunities" for other residents (none of whom share the cost of the sidewalk).

This is particularly burdensome at this point in our economic environment when many of us are struggling to keep our jobs and food on the table.

The nail in the coffin is the breakneck speed this project is at, especially given that our country has been in a state of emergency, with a national lockdown and government mandated stay at home orders. The difficulty in communicating, delays in information gathering, and inability to participate in person (and technical difficulties attending electronically) for what appears to be a less than essential project that has a huge financial impact on a small group of people

should necessitate a slower pace. The postcard announcing the Mar 12 meeting, the summary of the Mar 12 meeting and a letter dated May 6 were very slow to reach the property owners. Two of the property owners actually never received any of the correspondence (addressed to Habitat of the Humanities Office address, as they hold the mortgage on the properties) because the mail was never forwarded to them.

In these extraordinary times, we ask that at the very least the brakes be put on this project to give the affected parties time to gather information and have a fair opportunity to express their concerns to those making decisions have a significant impact on this small group of people.

While we fear that the City Council has already made up its mind this far into the project, we hope that you will re-evaluate and consider the tremendous negative impact this project imposes on this

group of tax paying citizens.

We thank you for your time and consideration.

Regards,

Qixing chen and Feng Liang
