

# Folder - Scioto Township

FROM: Charles Ream  
4600 W. Liberty Rd  
Ann Arbor, Mi. 48103

2/9/1988

TO: Local Government and Planning officials      Scioto Twp  
Washt. Cty.

Dear Folks

A couple of months ago I was shocked by the looks of a proposed Scioto Twp. development called "Liberty Park" (or "Farm"). I became active in organizing and research, thinking up the name and causing to be formed the group called "Scioto Citizens for Appropriate Development." I'm very proud that our mailing list of 360 households will now be combined with hundreds of names from the "Huron River Heights" citizens group to cement a potent township wide alliance against high density development.

We know development is inevitable but we will try to ensure that it is in the best possible taste and (outside the immediate Jackson Rd. corridor) that it is LOW density.

Now, however, things have gotten "curiouser and curiouser" (Alice in Wonderland). Our citizens group now nearly unanimously supports a development plan for the entire "Liberty Park" area plus many acres to the west of it. It seems that the Cooch Development Co. may very well buy out Mr. Dominick Libardi of "Liberty Park" and ask to put in 18 holes of golf with housing grouped within it. (Also, the "Liberty Park" plan is becoming a real "no win" situation - either it will be a referendum or a lawsuit or both).

Nearly everyone at the Jan 30 meeting, including the trustees who were present, agreed that this was a great use for the land. The only problem was that the sewer district would have to be



expanded.

We are more anxious than anyone to prevent the expansion of the sewer district if it is possible that such an extension would enable high density development. We need planners so brilliant and creative that they can allow the golf course plan without setting any dangerous bad precedents.

The outline of a solution is clear - to me anyway. We must exactly define the precedent we are setting and then let it be precedent. Let us define, by ordinance <sup>and</sup> or in the new general development plan that anyone may petition for sewer if

- 1) A part of the property to be developed is contiguous with the sewer district and
- 2) There will be only one single family building site per 1.2 acres of land (in the sewered area outside of the sewer district.) Areas not used for home sites must be permanently set aside by deed restriction to stay open and green.

This could be amply justified as

- 1) What the citizens want (We'll do a referendum if you'd like)
- 2) Keeping ~~lots outside the sewer~~ the lot to land ratio outside the sewer district up to at least 1 per acre.
- 3) Necessary to ensure that only a small amount of sewer capacity will be used by developments outside of present sewer district boundaries.

With the above stipulations this might be excellent precedent. I + would add incentive for clean, well planned, low density development in areas contiguous to the sewer district.

If extension of the sewer district means loads of condos, apartments on 10,000 sq. ft. lots then lets all fight it with all our energy. I don't think it



a beautiful "centerpiece" to ensure the lasting attractiveness of our township, and as a monument to our good common sense.

Lets think hard on this one and give it a little "second effort".

Sincerely

Charles Ream