



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

January 30, 2019

Shamrock Acquisitions, LLC
13910 Simone Drive
Shelby Township, MI 48315
Matthew Duffield
mduffield@shamrock-acq.com

Re: Brush Park CDC Response for Brush Park II - Building 13 (Alfred/Woodward)

Brush Park Community Development Corporation (the “CDC”) forwards this letter to indicate our support for the Brush Park II - Building 13 (the “Project”).

The Project was presented before the CDC and the Brush Park community at a public meeting held on Tuesday, January 15, 2019. Feedback from the community was mixed. Many residents expressed disappointment that a more modern design was not chosen for this project site. Residents also expressed concerns about the cheap materials that were used by Crosswinds, as evidenced by the current state of disrepair of several of the existing buildings. One member of the community who lives on Alfred Street stated that he was in favor of the design as it is more sympathetic to existing historic structures in the neighborhood. Your team explained to the community that the design of the building is being driven by the Brush Park II Condo Association, who own the rights to develop the project site and are insisting that the site be filled in with a design that mirrors the existing buildings in the condo association. You also expressed that while the project will look the same as existing structures, the quality of the materials for Building 13 will be better than those used for the existing structures.

Much consideration was given to the Project by the CDC Board. By a vote of 5 in favor, 2 objections and 1 abstention, the Board voted to support the Project. Please see Attachment A, which contains the opinions offered by the Board during the voting process for your consideration; please note, the opinions have no bearing on the Board’s vote and are included for your information only.

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

Sincerely,

Karissa Holmes, Secretary

Cc: City of Detroit Planning & Development

Attachment A: Poll Comments for “Crosswinds Building 13”

Below are the opinions submitted by CDC Board Members during the voting process for reference and consideration. Please note, the opinions have no bearing on the Board's final vote and are included for reference only.

Comment 1

I am not comfortable with the continuity of design that relates to the existing/adjacent properties..... Also, the quality of materials and privacy partitions between units.

Comment 2

This feels like a step backward for Brush Park. The sameness of Crosswinds is already a negative aspect and it contributes to the feeling that Crosswinds is its own neighborhood rather than part of a larger neighborhood; adding more of the same would only perpetuate these points. It would be cohesive to Crosswinds but not to the Brush Park neighborhood which offers variety, quality, and richness. I think the City and the developer could take the CDC's points back to the condo assoc. and find a compromise.

While I do not support this project as presented, the urban form is one acceptable component. However, one area of concern is the front stair which is such a large mass it feels like it should be considered part of the building and therefore is rather inconsistent with established setbacks of the existing historic home on the block to the east as well as the homes across the street.

Comment 3

I support the design of this project, echoing the support of the neighbors directly adjacent to this property, that this design is more in line with historic homes and existing condos completely encircling this property. I commend the developers on their promise to use higher quality materials and standards than the existing condos utilized at the time of their construction.

Comment 4

It would have been nice to have a letter from the condo association supporting the project and the design. But if what the developer says is true-- that the association will not allow variation in design from what was originally intended-- I do not think the CDC should interfere by suggesting a newer, fresher design. Sounds like an expensive legal rabbit hole...

Comment 4

For cohesiveness of the Woodward Place development, I support continuing the same design. I am glad that the developer will use better materials to avoid the interior and exterior quality issues that are plaguing the current buildings and units.

