



234 Winder Street • Detroit, MI 48201 • www.BrushParkCDC.org • BrushParkCDC@Gmail.com

May 15, 2019

Michael Van Overbeke
VanOverbeke, Michaud & Timmony, P.C.
79 Alfred Street
Detroit, MI 48201

Re: 112 Edmund Development

The Brush Park Community Development Corporation (the “CDC”) forwards this letter to provide feedback on the proposed multi-story mixed use residential development for the property located at 112 Edmund (the “Project”).

The updated Project plan was presented before the CDC and the Brush Park community at a public meeting held on April 29, 2019. Generally, community was appreciative of the vast number of changes made to the Project in response to prior community concerns and CDC feedback letter dated February 26, 2018. Residents still had questions and concerns about the height of the north end of the building, particularly the height compared to the Lucien Moore mansion on the adjacent parcel.

After careful consideration, by a vote of 5 in favor and 4 objections, the CDC board voted to support the Project. Attachment A contains the opinions offered by the Board during the voting process for your consideration; please note, the opinions should not be used to dispute the Board’s vote and are included for reference only. We do however that the developer consider these opinions for any additional changes to the project. Lastly, for the avoidance of doubt, this support does not extend to the 2827 John R & 105 Alfred Projects previously presented in connection with this Project.

We thank you again for your commitment to Brush Park and making a positive impact in our community.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Karissa Holmes", is written over a blue scribble.

Karissa Holmes, Secretary

Cc: City of Detroit Planning & Development

Attachment A: Poll Comments for 112 Edmund

Below are the opinions submitted by CDC Board Members during the voting process for reference and consideration. Please note, the opinions should not be used to dispute the Board's final vote and are included for reference only.

Comment 1:

The developer has made great strides toward a plan that is both good urban design and in line with the community vision; however, the height as it relates to an adjacent historic home is still a problem. The protection and celebration of the remaining historic homes in this historically designated neighborhood should be a top priority. This building still dwarfs the adjacent Lucien Moore home. While still taller and bulkier in mass than the home, the development would be acceptable at 4 floors. The neighborhood is still without an approved plan; however, the draft form-based code (11/02/18) states: "Any new structure immediately adjacent to an existing historic house is allowed a maximum of four (4) stories or must provide a fifth story step back with a minimum of fifty-five (55) feet from the front facade of the abutting building." I strongly support this drafted language, or one similar, based on the spirit of its goal in protecting existing historic homes. Options for the developer may include going down to 4 stories entirely, or providing a 5th story stepback where 55' or greater in distance from the historic house, resulting in a partially single-loaded corridor at the 5th floor.

Comment 2:

Knowing that the FBC is not yet approved, I still believe that the spirit of the proposed code—specifically as it relates to limiting the height of new developments directly adjacent to a historic home—should be adhered to. Numerous community members and board members have voiced concern over the height of the current design adjacent to the extant historic home and agreeing with this concern, I do not support the current design.

Comment 3:

For whatever reason, this private developer has managed to avoid competing in an RFP process, in his bid to acquire this city owned property. That process alone, should normally have separated out development proposals that fly in the face of what is best for the community of Brush Park residents and the City of Detroit. Instead, we have toiled through countless public and private meetings, in the effort to put the public good before private profit. We have made tremendous headway toward achieving a plan for 112 Edmund that is both financially feasible for the developer and compatible with the highest and best usage of the site, as it fits into the historic urban fabric of Brush Park. The developer has just shown us a proposal that build a structure at 112 Edmund that is 4 stories tall on one end and 5 on the other. If it's wasn't financially feasible to built that, then he wouldn't be pitching it. I would be voting yes, if the developer had just followed the spirit and intent of the draft form based code, and kept the building height at 4 stories adjacent to the historic structure. The draft form based code isn't just a document to be dodged. It is the culminated of hundreds, if not thousands of hours of community meetings, city administration research and work hours, and a global compilation of best practices as we understand them in 2019. We the volunteer community board, as well as



our esteemed public servants in our city's administration, are the bulwark and mediator between unfettered selfish capitalism (ex. the district) and what contributes positively to the greater good. OF ALL PEOPLE, an investor vying for a public asset, especially absent a fair competitive RFP process, should ideally seek to serve the greater public good first, and tweak the project for profit second. We have laid out a fair and reasonable path for this development to proceed. I look forward to a revised to appropriate building height, so that I can vote yes! Come on!

Comment 4:

The developers has been considerate of the communities in concerns and compromised in many aspects of this project. There are still concerns that need to be addressed, but overall, I believe that the project finally represents a project that would be appropriate for the neighborhood and would contribute positively to the neighborhood. It is unfortunate that the City of Detroit has YET to approve a final form based code, such that our community organization is being held responsible to give an opinion on aspects of the project that should be determined by law/code. I again urge the City to take care of its responsibility here so that our neighborhood organization is not continuously burdened with making these decisions.

