# PLANNING COMMISSION <br> MEETING AGENDA <br> REGULAR MEETING 

David Lambert, Chairman, Marianna Perakis, Vice Chairman
Toby Buechner, Carlton Faison, Michael W. Hutson, Tom Krent, Lakshmi Malalahalli, Sadek Rahman and John J. Tagle

1. ROLL CALL
2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - April 12, 2022
4. PUBLIC COMMENT - For Items Not on the Agenda

## PUBLIC HEARING

5. PUBLIC HEARING - PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN REVIEW (SP JPLN2021-0023) Proposed Eckford Oaks One Family Residential Cluster, North side of Eckford, West of Rochester (PIN 88-20-15-251-026 \& 88-20-15-251-017), Section 15, Currently Zoned R1B (One Family Residential) District

## OTHER ITEMS

6. PUBLIC COMMENTS - For Items on the Agenda
7. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENT
8. ADJOURN

Chair Lambert called the Regular meeting of the Troy City Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. on April 12, 2022, in the Council Chamber of the Troy City Hall. Chair Lambert and Vice Chair Perakis presented opening remarks relative to the role of the Planning Commission and procedure of tonight's meeting.

## 1. ROLL CALL

Present:
Toby Buechner
Carlton M. Faison
Michael W. Hutson
Tom Krent
David Lambert
Lakshmi Malalahalli
Marianna Perakis
Sadek Rahman
John J. Tagle
Also Present:
R. Brent Savidant, Community Development Director

Ben Carlisle, Carlisle Wortman Associates
Julie Quinlan Dufrane, Assistant City Attorney
Kathy L. Czarnecki, Recording Secretary
2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Resolution \# PC-2022-04-020
Moved by: Krent
Support by: Faison
RESOLVED, To remove Agenda items \#5 and \#6, Preliminary Site Plan Reviews for Westington Phase II and Hills West, at the request of the applicant.

Yes: All present (9)
MOTION CARRIED
Resolution \# PC-2022-04-021
Moved by: Buechner
Support by: Perakis
RESOLVED, To approve the Agenda as amended.
Yes: All present (9)
MOTION CARRIED

## 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - March 22, 2022

Resolution \# PC-2022-04-022
Moved by: Malalahalli
Support by: Hutson
RESOLVED, To approve the minutes of the March 22, 2022 Regular meeting as submitted.

Yes: Buechner, Faison, Hutson, Krent, Lambert, Malalahalli, Perakis, Rahman Abstain: Tagle

MOTION CARRIED
4. PUBLIC COMMENT - For Items Not on the Agenda

There was no one present who wished to speak.
(Agenda items \#5 and \#6 removed from the Agenda. Refer to Resolution \#PC-2022-04-020)

## OTHER ITEMS

7. PUBLIC COMMENT - For Items on the Agenda

There was no one present who wished to speak.

## 8. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENT

Mr. Carlisle addressed the first meeting of the Neighborhood Nodes subcommittee. He shared that the subcommittee reviewed the intent of the Neighborhood Nodes section in the Master Plan and nine neighborhood nodes, parcel by parcel. Mr. Carlisle said the subcommittee would review the remaining neighborhood nodes at their second meeting on April 13, and that a third meeting would be scheduled to prepare a summary of their conclusions and recommendations which would be presented to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Savidant addressed the effectiveness of a subcommittee and noted the committee accomplished a lot in their 3-hour meeting. He told Board members to expect significant changes to the intent of the Neighborhood Nodes section in the Master Plan. Mr. Savidant announced the subcommittee meetings are open to the public and one can speak during the public comment section of the agenda.

Chair Lambert said the subcommittee findings will ultimately come before the Planning Commission for a collective decision.

## 9. ADJOURN

The Regular meeting of the Planning Commission adjourned at 7:09 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

David Lambert, Chair

Kathy L. Czarnecki, Recording Secretary
https://d.docs.live.net/2f7ed4fe5f664ea8/Documents/Kathy/COT Planning Commission Minutes/2022/2022 0412 Draft.docx

DATE: April 21, 2022
TO: Planning Commission
FROM: R. Brent Savidant, Community Development Director
SUBJECT: PUBLIC HEARING - PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN REVIEW (SP JPLN2021-0023) Proposed Eckford Oaks One Family Residential Cluster, North side of Eckford, West of Rochester (PIN 88-20-15-251-026 \& 88-20-15-251-017), Section 15, Currently Zoned R-1B (One Family Residential) District

The petitioner Troy Eckford, LLC submitted the above referenced Preliminary Site Plan application for a 26 -unit One Family Residential Cluster. The development proposes to preserve $54 \%$ open space on the 8.7-acre parcel. The Planning Commission is responsible for providing a recommendation to City Council for this item.

The attached report prepared by Carlisle/Wortman Associates, Inc. (CWA), the City's Planning Consultant, summarizes the project. CWA prepared the report with input from various City departments including Planning, Engineering, Public Works and Fire. City Management supports the findings of fact contained in the report and the recommendations included therein.

Attachments:

1. Maps
2. Report prepared by Carlisle/Wortman Associates, Inc.
3. Preliminary Site Plan Application
4. Public comment

G:ISITE PLANSISP JPLN2021-0023 TROY ECKFORD WOODS-clusterlPC Memo 202204 26.docx

## PROPOSED RESOLUTION

PUBLIC HEARING - PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN REVIEW (SP JPLN2021-0023) Proposed Eckford Oaks One Family Residential Cluster, North side of Eckford, West of Rochester (PIN 88-20-15-251-026 \& 88-20-15-251-017), Section 15, Currently Zoned R-1B (One Family Residential) District

## Resolution \# PC-2022-04-

Moved by:
Support by:
RESOLVED, The Planning Commission hereby recommends to the City Council that the proposed Eckford Oaks Site Condominium (One Family Residential Cluster), 26 units/lots, North side of Eckford, West of Rochester (Parcels 88-20-15-275-016, 88-20-15-275-017), Section 15, approximately 8.7 acres in size, Currently Zoned R-1B (One Family Residential) District, be approved for the following reasons:

1. The cluster development better protects the sites natural resources than if the site were not developed as a cluster.
2. The cluster development better protects the adjacent properties than if the site were not developed as a cluster.
3. The cluster development is compatible with adjacent properties.
4. The site can be adequately served with municipal water and sewer.
5. The cluster development preserves $45 \%$ open space, to remain open space in perpetuity.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, The Planning Commission offers the following design considerations:

1. Applicant shall indicate limits of grading to confirm impact upon onsite wetlands and floodplains, prior to Final Site Plan Approval.

Yes:
Absent:
MOTION CARRIED

## TROY cIS Online


1,189

Note. The information provided by this application has been compiled from recorded deeds, plats, tax data are hereby notified that the source information represented should be consulted for verification.

## TROY GISOnline



Date: April 15, 2022

# Preliminary Site Condominium Cluster Review For <br> City of Troy, Michigan 

| Project Name: | Eckford Oaks |
| :--- | :--- |
| Plan Date: | March 18, 2022 |
| Location: | North side of Eckford, between Rochester and Livernois |
| Zoning: | R-1C, One-family Residential District |
| Action Requested: | Preliminary Site Condominium Cluster Approval |
| Required Information: | Deficiencies noted. |

## PROJECT AND SITE DESCRIPTION

We are in receipt of a preliminary site plan application for a twenty-six (26) unit detached single-family condominium cluster development. The twenty-six (26) new lots will be accessed from a new private road that is located off Eckford Drive. The site is comprised of two parcels and is a total of 8.7 acres. The site is vacant but encumbered with wetlands, floodplain, floodway, and tree cover.

The applicant proposes a cluster development. The base density base under the R-1C, OneFamily Residential as determined by the submission of a parallel plan is twenty-one (21) units. The applicant is seeking five (5) additional units above the parallel plan density by doing a cluster, providing $45 \%$ of the total site as open space, and preserving area around the Houghton Drain.

The applicant is proposing three housing option types which range in size from an $1,800 \mathrm{sq} / \mathrm{ft}$ ranch with second floor option to a $2,500 \mathrm{sq} / \mathrm{ft}$ colonial.

Furthermore, the applicant is also providing a 10 -foot wide public bike path through their development. The path is intended to continue the path that starts at the Daisy Knight Dog Park on Livernois through the DPW site just to the north.

Figure 1. - Location and Aerial Image of Subject Site


## Size of Subject Property:

The parcel is 8.7 acres

## Proposed Uses of Subject Parcel:

Twenty-six (26) detached single family condominium cluster development.

## Current Use of Subject Property:

The subject property is currently vacant

## Current Zoning:

The property is currently zoned R-1C, One-family Residential District.

## Surrounding Property Details:

| Direction | Zoning | Use |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North | EP, Environmental Protection / CF, Community |  |
| Facility |  |  | | Department of Public |
| :---: |
| Works facility |$|$| South | R-1C, One-family Residential District | Single-family homes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| East | R-1C, One-family Residential District | Single-family homes |
| West | R-1C, One-family Residential District | Single-family homes |



## NATURAL RESOURCES

The southern portion of the site is bisected by the Houghton Drain.
Topography: A topographic survey has been provided on sheet V -1.0. The site slopes from the north into the southern portion that contains the Houghton Drain.

Wetlands: The wetland delineation report found eight (8) wetland and one watercourse likely regulated by the Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes \& Energy (EGLE).

The applicant appears to impact wetlands including those associated within the Houghton Drain.

Floodplain: The submitted topography survey shows the existing conditions of the onsite floodplain. The Engineering Department notes that FEMA approval of Flood Plain boundary will be required and OCDC permit for work around Houghton Drain will be required. The applicant should show limits of grading to indicate amount of potential disturbance to floodplain, and wetlands.


Woodlands: A tree survey has been provided to inventory the natural features that exist onsite. The survey identified a total of approximately 313 trees on site. Most are noted as good quality with only a few invasive species. The applicant proposes to remove 153 regulated trees and protect 160 regulated trees. Full replacement and preservation details are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. - Woodland Protection Ordinance

| Replacement Details |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Protected Tree | Inches Removed | Replacement Required |  |
| Landmark | 1356 inches | 1356 inches |  |
| Woodland | 997 inches | 479 inches |  |
| Preservation/Mitigation | Inches Preserved | Credit |  |
| Landmark | 1084 inches | 2168 inches |  |
| Woodland | 898 inches | 1796 inches |  |
|  | 0 <br> Total <br> preserved and credited exceed the mitigation required. |  |  |

Items to be addressed: Applicant should indicate limits of grading to confirm impact upon onsite wetlands and floodplains.

## SITE ARRANGEMENT

The proposed one-family cluster development consists of twenty-six (26) units. All twenty-six (26) new lots will be accessed from a new private road off Eckford Drive. The proposed lots range between $6,492 \mathrm{sq}$. ft . and $15,048 \mathrm{sq}$. ft .

The applicant has submitted a parallel plan to establish a base density and portray the visual difference between traditional site design versus a cluster development. The cluster option is offered as an alternative to traditional residential development. The cluster option is intended to:

1. Encourage the use of property in accordance with its natural character.
2. Assure the permanent preservation of open space and other natural features.
3. Provide recreational facilities and/or open space within a reasonable distance of all residents of the Cluster development.
4. Allow innovation and greater flexibility in the design of residential developments.
5. Facilitate the construction and maintenance of streets, utilities, and public services in a more economical and efficient manner.
6. Ensure compatibility of design and use between neighboring property.
7. Encourage a less sprawling form of development, thus preserving open space as undeveloped land.
8. Allow for design innovation to provide flexibility for land development where the normal development approach would otherwise be unnecessarily restrictive or contrary to other City goals

Items to be addressed: Planning Commission shall determine if requirements are met to qualify for cluster development options and if the additional number of units is commensurate with open space being preserved.

## AREA, WIDTH, HEIGHT, SETBACKS and REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY

The intent of the cluster development provisions is to relax the typical R-1C district bulk requirements in order to encourage a less sprawling form of development that preserves open space and natural resources. As set forth in 10.04.E the applicant is able to seek specific departures from the dimensional requirements of the Zoning Ordinance for yards and perimeter setback as a part of the approval process.

Table 1. - Bulk Requirements

|  | Required/Allowed | Provided | Compliance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Density | Overall density shall not exceed the number of residential cluster units as developed under a conventional site condominium, unless a density bonus has been granted by City Council. | Base Density $=21$ units <br> + Cluster bonus (45\% bonus) <br> $=30$ units are allowed <br> The applicant is seeking 26 units. | Complies. <br> 26 units are permitted with City Council approval. |
| Perimeter Setback | Equal to the rear yard setback requirement for the underlying zoning district of the property directly adjacent to each border $=40$ feet on east and west perimeter setback. <br> Varies between 25 -feet and 40 feet on the north side. | Deck for units 6 encroaches 10 feet and decks for units 5, 7-12 encroach 5 -feet into the required 25 -foot perimeter setback along northern property line. <br> Unit 13 encroaches up to 20 feet into the required 50 -foot perimeter setback along the northern property line | Complies with City Council relief of setbacks. |
| Lot Size | 10,500 sq. ft. | Range in size from $6,492 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. and 15,048 sq. ft. | Complies with approval of Cluster by City Council |
| Front Setback (building) | 20 feet | 25 feet | Compiles |
| Rear Setback (building) | 25-feet setback | Decks for units 5-12, 15, 17-25 encroach into the required 25 foot rear yard setback | Complies with City Council relief of setbacks. |
| Side Setback (building) | 7.5-feet setback | 7.5-feet minimum | Complies |
| Open Space Requirements: Minimum Percentage | 20\% | Proposing to preserve 4.0 acres of the 8.7 acres, or $45 \%$ for open space. | Complies. Applicant must submit open space preservation covenant. |

Deck for units 6 encroaches 10 feet and decks for units 5, 7-12 encroach 5-feet into the required 25foot perimeter setback along northern property line. Unit 13 encroaches up to 20 feet into the required 50 -foot perimeter setback along the northern property line. Please note that these encroachments are along the northern property line, which abut to the DPW yard and city owned Environmental Protection zoned property. In addition, decks for units 5-12, 15, 17-25 encroach into the required 25 -foot rear yard setback.

The City Council, based upon a recommendation from the Planning Commission, may waive the perimeter and rear lot provisions provided that the applicant has demonstrated innovative and creative site and building designs and solutions, which would otherwise be unfeasible or unlikely to be achieved absent this provision. The Planning Commission should consider the purpose and intent of the Cluster Development option in considering the setback deviations.

We find these appropriate waivers to allow a limited encroachment for decks.

Items to be addressed: Consider the deck encroachment into perimeter and rear buffer

## OPEN SPACE REQUIREMENTS

A requirement of the Cluster Option is to provide at least one (1) of the following open space benefits:
a. Significant Natural Features. Preservation of significant natural features contained on the site, as long as it is in the best interest of the City to preserve the natural features that might be negatively impacted by conventional residential development. The determination of whether the site has significant natural features shall be made by the City Council, after review of a Natural Features Analysis, prepared by the applicant, that inventories these features; or
b. Recreation Facilities. If the site lacks significant natural features, it can qualify with the provision of usable recreation facilities to which all residents of the development shall have reasonable access. Such recreation facilities include areas such as a neighborhood park, passive recreational facilities, soccer fields, ball fields, bike paths, or similar facilities that provide a feature of community-wide significance and enhance residential development. Recreational facilities that are less pervious than natural landscape shall not comprise more than fifty (50) percent of the open space. The determination of whether the site has significant natural features shall be made by the City Council after review of a Site Analysis Plan, prepared by the applicant, that inventories these features; or
c. Preservation of Common Open Space or Creation of Natural Features. If the site lacks significant natural features, a proposed development may also qualify if the development will preserve common open space or create significant natural features such as wetlands. The determination of whether the site has significant natural features shall be made by the City Council after review of a Site Analysis Plan, prepared by the applicant, which inventories these features.

The site is 8.7 acres, and the applicant is proposing to reserve 4.0 acres for common open space, or $45 \%$ of the total site. Open space is provided along the Houghton Drain, which bisects the site. As part of the review, the Planning Commission is to consider and make a recommendation to City Council if the layout and open space plan meets the intent and standards of the Cluster provision and has the applicant creatively designed the site to either preserve significant natural resources (trees, wetland, and floodplain) or provide quality open space.

## Guarantee of Open Space and Tree Preservation:

The applicant shall provide documentation to guarantee that all open space portions of the development will be preserved and maintained as approved and that all commitments for
such preservation and maintenance are binding on successors and future owners of the subject property. All such documents shall be subject to approval by the City Attorney. No structures (pools, sheds) or equipment (play structures, etc.) are permitted within the dedicated open space area.

Items to be addressed: Planning Commission is to consider and make a recommendation to City Council if the layout and open space plan, and/or natural features meet the intent of the Cluster provision and has the applicant creatively designed the site to either preserve significant natural resources (trees) or provide quality open space.

## SITE ACCESS AND CIRCULATION

## Vehicular

Access to the site will be from a single location off Eckford Drive. The development will be served by an internal twenty-eight (28) foot wide private road, located inside of a forty (40) foot roadway easement.

## Pedestrian

The applicant proposes a five (5) foot wide concrete sidewalk along the perimeter of the private road. The internal sidewalk will connect to existing sidewalk on Eckford Drive.

The applicant is also providing a 10-foot wide public bike path through their development. The path is intended to continue the path that starts at the Daisy Knight Dog Park on Livernois through the DPW site just to the north.

Items to be Addressed: City Engineer to review site access and circulation.

## STORMWATER

Stormwater will be managed by a regional detention system.

Items to be Addressed: None.

## LANDSCAPING

One-Family Cluster development landscaping requirements are regulated by Section 13.02.F.2.

Table 2. - Landscaping Requirements

| Frontage | Required | Provided | Compliance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Proposed Private <br> Road | One (1) deciduous tree for <br> every 50 lineal feet. <br> $1,795 / 50=36$ trees $=36$ <br> trees | 36 trees | Complies |
| Eckford | One (1) large evergreen <br> tree per fifty (50) lineal <br> feet. <br> 296 If/50 If $=6$ evergreen <br> trees | 6 proposed | Complies |

Items to be Addressed: None.

## ELEVATIONS AND FLOOR PLANS

The applicant has submitted a five housing options ranging from 1,800 to $2,500 \mathrm{sq} / \mathrm{ft}$. All are one story. Materials were not indicted

Items to be Addressed: Indicate materials.

## CLUSTER STANDARDS

As set forth in section 10.04.I, the applicant shall demonstrate that through the use of the Cluster option, the development will accomplish a sufficient number of the following objectives, as are reasonably applicable to the site, providing:
a. Long-term protection and preservation of natural resources, natural features, and open space of a significant quantity and/or quality in need of protection or preservation, and which would otherwise be unfeasible or unlikely to be achieved absent these regulations.
b. Innovative and creative site design through flexibility in the siting of dwellings and other development features that would otherwise be unfeasible or unlikely to be achieved absent these regulations.
c. Appropriate buffer and/or land use transitions between the Cluster development and surrounding properties.
d. A compatible mixture of open space, landscaped areas, and/or pedestrian amenities.
e. Sustainable design features and techniques, such as green building, stormwater management best practices, and low impact design, which will promote and encourage energy conservation and sustainable development.
f. A means for owning common open space and for protecting it from development in perpetuity.
g. Any density bonus is commensurate with the benefit offered to achieve such bonus.
h. The cluster development shall be adequately served by essential public facilities and services, such as: streets, pedestrian or bicycle facilities, police and fire protection,
drainage systems, refuse disposal, water and sewage facilities, and schools. Such services shall be provided and accommodated without an unreasonable public burden.
i. The architectural form, scale, and massing shall ensure buildings are in proportion and complementary to those of adjacent properties and the selected building materials are of high, durable quality. The garage shall not be the dominant feature of a residential building.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Planning Commission shall determine if requirements are met to qualify for cluster development option, if the required standards have been met, and if the additional number of units is commensurate with open space being preserved.

Items to consider include:

- Applicant should indicate limits of grading to confirm impact upon onsite wetlands and floodplains.
- Applicant is seeking following relief:
o Decks for units 5-12, 15, 17-25 encroach into the required 25-foot rear yard setback Decks for units 14-18 encroach into the 40 -foot perimeter setback
o Deck for units 6 encroaches 10 feet and decks for units 5, 7-12 encroach 5feet into the required 25 -foot perimeter setback along northern property line. Unit 13 encroaches up to 20 feet into the required 50 -foot perimeter setback along the northern property line
- Indicate materials

The Planning Commission may request that either the applicant address aforementioned items or make a recommendation for City Council consideration.
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DEVELOPER
ICON DEVELOPMENT, LLC
35520 FORTON COURT
CLINTON TOWNSHIP, MI 48035
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| From: | Anthony Kapas Kapas |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Lackie Ferencz |
| Subject: | Proposed Eckford Woods |
| Date: | Friday, January 14, 2022 1:18:35 PM |

CAUTION: This email did not originate from within the City of Troy. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Jackie, thank you for providing the information regarding the Eckford Woods project and it's proposed date being delayed until after feb 3 in front of the planning board. As I explained to you when I came into the city, this project in addition to the yet to be proposed project across Eckford ( the prior Darcy properties now owned by Mondrian properties LLC). I would like to provide the following preliminary comments should I some how miss the planning meeting.

I have spoken to Mr Savidant on a few occasions regarding both projects and although the Eckford woods project does show functional use of the land as well as represent quite a substantial additional tax revenue for the city, it does not fit the current typical property definitions for the street. We have all heard the old saying In real estate it all boils down to three things... Location, location, location. This builder recognizes this. That is why he is seeking to build where he is, it represents a very lucrative unique project in the city of Troy, within the highly desirable Troy high school limits. I recognize that it would adversely effect my property value in a number of ways.

1. The project ( further impacted by the additional project across the street). Will completely change the look and feel of our small street. This portion of the street is currently composed of lots approximately 1 acre in size and the plans I have seen for the Eckford Woods (EW) reduce that to lots conciderably smaller in size ( approx $1 / 4$ acre or less)
2. Our quaint dirt road will be required to be paved by the builders.
3. My lot and property will be sandwiched between the existing subdivision on my west, the newly proposed subdivision on the east and looking out my front door the yet to be proposed subdivision. Even the representative for Eckford Woods indicated that my property will be an island in a sea of new construction/new housing when completed.
4. Traffic will increase dramatically on our street due to the additional housing, and due to the removal of the dirt portion of the road, cut through traffic between Rochester rd, and Livernois road will increase as well.
5. I was approached by the builders agent regarding purchasing my property and to see if we would be interested in selling thus in effect flowing from the existing subdivision on the west side into a common style area through the end of (EW) but they are only willing to pay for the value of the land and do not recognize that to accept this for my 3200 sf home with its 6 car garage and 2 acres is well below market value. Indicating the only thing they are interested in was the land. (had I owned a small house, this would not have been a concern as the land value would have far exceeded the house value). And in fact the offer I received from them was originally almost $20 \%$ below the offer I received when Plulti builders were intending on building on the property 3 years ago ( I do believe that all of us would agree that values in Troy have gone up dramatically within the last 3 years). I do believe that one thing all of us in the room will agree upon is the fact that property values have gone up dramatically within the last 3 years).

We have all seen it before, driven down a street and see a home surrounded by either a sub division , buildings, or some other type of improvement and thought that the owners were stupid for not selling when that construction
around them was being done. In my own mind I've thought that the owners must have been attempting to get astronomical amounts for their property to be included. I can assure you that in this instance, this is not the case. I derived my value by common real estate practices of looking to similar sized homes, took the average sale price then discounted that by the fact that I would not be required to pay real estate commissions. I did not account for the size of my garage, nor the additional out builder or many other factors when proposing my value.

As proof of this, I offer up 5 property addresses on Larchwood on the west side of John R road. 1910, 1920, 1930, 1950, and 1970 Larchwood. Each of these residential homes (that were originally on a residential street) are now surrounded by commercial properties. Each of these properties are in effect not able to be sold and have in fact been rental since as far back as I can research. Each of these house owners have attempt d to sell their homes multiple times. Only to find that they are unsuccessful to receive any offers remotely near prevailing rates. In addition, I myself have argued this with the city council back in the early 90 's. The property next to my then first home (31 Cloveridge) was being bought by the owner of the commercial property next to it on Livernois. City council argued with me indicating that a parking lot and brick wall was much better for my property values than the existing home was. I have attempted many times to sell my home (47 Cloveridge). But the prevailing reason I receive as the primary turn off to the house is the parking lot and brick wall that I am now stuck with. If I have received offered on the home they are typically $30 \%$ and in some cases up to $50 \%$ below market value. All of the offers I have received have been from investment companies with multiple rental properties. If allowed to build this project as currently proposed, this builder will in fact indirectly steal most of the appreciation in my property. The issue with this is I had intended on moving within the next 5 years anyway ( I am getting older and no longer need the space this house has). but when I do, exactly who can I hold accountable for the decline in my property's value once the builder has completed this project taken his (and my) profits and moved to the next area? The city will shrug their shoulders and indicate that being locked between these subdivision did not adversely effect my value and (if anything) will attempt to point to some other unknown factors. The builder will be nowhere to be found and I will be left with a property that was once considered "living the dream" by one of the members on this board.

Just so you don't misunderstand, I recognize that Eckford will be developed at some point in time (most likely soon since this builder does own the property) but, I suggest that if they are unwilling to take the bad with the good, that they build properties lot that are comparable to the ones surrounding the land they intend to build on ( as I stated prior approx 1 acre in size). This will ensure that they will not adversely effect any other property owners values and would be considered an acceptable compromise to me. ( they currently own approx 9 acres so 9-10 lots in lue of the 26 proposed ).

Lastely, The builders agent has indicated that this is a done deal with the city, I pray that is not the case. I hope you take my concerns seriously, and not just the additional tax dollars into account when looking at this project as well as other proposed projects in the area.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide this feedback,

Anthony Kapas
Owner / resident 501 Eckford, Troy mi
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