

**From:** Dharma Akmon <[dharmrae@umich.edu](mailto:dharmrae@umich.edu)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 06, 2021 2:57 PM

**To:** Planning <[Planning@a2gov.org](mailto:Planning@a2gov.org)>

**Cc:** CityCouncil <[CityCouncil@a2gov.org](mailto:CityCouncil@a2gov.org)>

**Subject:** Allow more bikers, pedestrians, and transit riders to move to Ann Arbor!

Hello!

As a long-time Ann Arbor resident, I've been really sad in recent years to see an ever increasing number of my friends unable to afford living here. I did not move here in 2003 to be in a rich enclave: I want to live in a place where people from all walks of life can make their home be that people waiting tables, working at the hospital, or making art.

I was excited to learn that for the first time in Ann Arbor history, the city council has directed the planning commission to change zoning rules so that apartments can be built in certain places outside the downtown without needing a parking space! This will be a big boon for both livability and affordability.

I urge you to vote in favor of this change so we can have more housing density; and I hope we can expand the scale to more areas. Planning around cars is not it in 2021 with the looming environmental crises and current housing crisis.

Thank you!

Dharma

**From:** Ken Clark <[kenclark@ameritech.net](mailto:kenclark@ameritech.net)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 06, 2021 2:38 PM

**To:** Planning <[Planning@a2gov.org](mailto:Planning@a2gov.org)>

**Subject:** Zoning Outside Downtown for Apartments without Parking Requirements - YES!

Planning Commissioners,

I'm told that you'll be considering creating zoning options for apartments outside the downtown to not require car/truck parking. I think this is an excellent proposal, and long overdue. There are many parts of Ann Arbor that are quite accessible by walking, biking, transit, scooters, and shared vehicle and ride services. Providing car and truck parking is an expensive and wasteful use of land. As things stand now, we provide subsidies to drivers of personal vehicles at the expense of - and to the detriment of - people who want other options. Our zoning should not be creating that situation.

I think this is a positive move, and I appreciate your consideration of it,  
Ken Clark  
497 Larkspur St.  
Ann Arbor

**From:** John Mirsky <[johnmirsky@gmail.com](mailto:johnmirsky@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 06, 2021 3:44 PM  
**To:** Planning <[Planning@a2gov.org](mailto:Planning@a2gov.org)>  
**Subject:** Corridor Zoning District

Dear Commissioners,

I support the proposed Transit Corridor Zoning District proposal that you are considering this evening and hope that it will receive your vote of approval so that it advances to City Council.

We are in the midst of three simultaneous crises: a housing crisis - affordable and in general, a climate crisis, and a social justice crisis. Thus, it's important that Ann Arbor move decisively to implement solutions like the proposed corridor zoning districts to help alleviate them. While there are risks associated with moving too quickly, the greater risk is moving too slowly and bureaucratically. Please consider how corridor districts can be piloted quickly and then expanded ASAP so that: (a) more corridors can be added (for example S Industrial Blvd., Packard Road, Ann Arbor-Saline Road, or North Main Street); (b) their length can be increased (for example along S. State Street and Plymouth Road); (c) the eligible distance properties can be from the corridors can be increased, where appropriate; and (d) increases the types of zoning of properties eligible for rezoning.

Corridor zoning districts will help Ann Arbor address all of the aforementioned crises as well as improve the quality of life in Ann Arbor for residents and current and future non-residents alike by helping create 20' mixed-use walking neighborhoods. The proposed changes will improve the character of Ann Arbor, not destroy it, and will result in 'wins' for the vast majority of all.

Thank-you,

John Mirsky  
Chair, A2 Energy Commission and member, A2 Environmental Commissioner

**From:** Kirk Westphal <[writetokirk@gmail.com](mailto:writetokirk@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 06, 2021 4:30 PM  
**To:** Planning <[Planning@a2gov.org](mailto:Planning@a2gov.org)>  
**Subject:** Please strengthen and pass a corridor zoning district

Dear Commissioners:

Thank you once again for your attention to this incredibly important effort.

Here are my suggestions for what I believe will be a more flexible, usable district that will help meet the community's long-anticipated wishes. I sincerely hope that you advance this district to City Council with a strong recommendation to initiate rezonings as soon as possible. If you agree that more properties should have the opportunity to develop in the much more responsible manner that TC1 provides, I don't believe there's a need to postpone or delay your vote: you can just vote on the changes and ask our wonderful staff to alter the maps and ordinance language before sending them to council for feedback.

1) Expand the length of the currently proposed corridors, particularly going north on S State (up to Stimson or Packard) and going west on Plymouth (to North Campus/Murfin and the hospital/Lowertown). Some of the most desirable land for housing—walkable to UM campuses and the hospital—are on the same bus route yet outside the boundaries of the current proposal.

2) Expand the number of proposed corridors to include Industrial, Packard, S Main and Ann Arbor-Saline. I hear the case being made that we should be careful about where we add density. But between the problems with construction costs due to material and labor expenses, a wide assortment of parcel ownership, and the myriad long-term leases that exist in shopping centers, I just don't believe that we're going to be overrun with buildings and people with torches and pitchforks outside AAATA demanding more frequent service. (And I have every confidence that when we do grow as a city, the increased tax revenue to AAATA will be used responsibly to strategically add service where most needed. Bike infrastructure and micromobility will also fill in the gaps.) Each place we say "no" to opportunities for compact, car-light development within the city limits means we say "yes" to more low-density, auto-oriented development in town and adding to the 80,000 car commuters and sprawl development out of town.

3) Expand the zoning to include parcels within 1/4 mile of corridors. The current language allows buildings to reach 1/2 mile away from bus stops (which is effectively everywhere) but requires the parcel they're on to literally abut the corridor. I think this is extremely limiting. Why not allow a parcel that's 200 feet away from a transit corridor to participate? This will capture Briarwood and other parcels that are a sensible walkable radius from bus lines. (I understand the desire to force someplace like Briarwood to assemble parcels around it for a complete development that faces a main street, but I'm guessing that can be done more directly with other language that mandates "facing the corridor.")

4) Expand the number of zoning types eligible for rezoning, and don't limit the future eligible corridors solely to existing "commercial and office" uses. If you really don't want to include S Industrial Blvd right now, for example, leaving the current ordinance language as-is would eliminate that possibility because of its light industrial zoning. Also, please don't exclude the commercial-ish, low-density residential districts of R4A/B/D and R5. We see what the exclusion of these districts does to the current maps (see the R5/Hotel district carve-out on Plymouth & US-23 and State &

I-94, and the R4 avoidance near Washtenaw and Platt). This is the appropriate time to be talking about them because they are virtually all on transit corridors. What is good about forcing low-density hotels and apartment complexes to keep their huge open spaces and large parking minimums when they redevelop? I think detached residential deserves a different master planning process, so please consider just naming the zoning districts that are not applicable for TC1 zoning—for example, all R1, R2 and R3 districts, and R4C. If you can't justify the resource-wasting rules of a district, please allow it to become more sustainable.

5) Require mixed-use buildings with active ground floor uses within 100 feet of corners. I'm glad that the current version doesn't mandate mixed use buildings everywhere, but I do think it's important at corners. Perhaps after a decade or two of mostly residential development, I'm hopeful the major corners will become mini-downtowns of new urban villages. But it pains me to imagine a wonderful new mixed-use development at the corner of Jackson and Maple... with a massive Wells Fargo or a small, locked apartment lobby on the ground floor. We should play the long game and give these districts a chance to have an identity and some popular amenities that are open at night by reserving important corners.

#### Minor notes

- I think the last draft's more gentle treatment of height close to residential would make these changes more palatable to near neighbors, and I still think allowing up to an 18' setback from fast-moving streets will help the survival of ground floor businesses. I'll attach my proposed height and setbacks.
- Should we consider prohibiting parking within 100 feet of the ROW to prevent ground floor parking with transparent windows to the street?

Thank you again for your consideration and service!

Kirk Westphal  
3505 Charter Pl  
734-660-9955

Setback from R (ft)	Height max (ft)	Stories (approx)
50-65	35	2-3
65-75	45	3-4
75-110	63	4-5
110-150	73	5-6
150-300	85	6-7
300+	280	20-25

Allow up to a ~18' front setback instead of capping at 10' to avoid proximity to fast moving traffic.

TC1 WOULD IMPROVE THESE  
PROPERTIES

