

Subject: Comprehensive Land Use Plan Feedback: PAUSE THE PLAN

From: Babette Levy Daskin

Sent: Wednesday, May 14, 2025 5:55 PM

To: Mallek, Jon <JMallek@a2gov.org>; Watson, Chris <CWatson@a2gov.org>; Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>

Cc: Taylor, Christopher (Mayor) <CTaylor@a2gov.org>; Disch, Lisa <LDisch@a2gov.org>; Harrison, Cynthia <CHarrison@a2gov.org>; Radina, Travis <TRadina@a2gov.org>; Ghazi Edwin, Ayesha <AGhaziEdwin@a2gov.org>; Eyer, Jen <JEyer@a2gov.org>; Akmon, Dharma <DAkmon@a2gov.org>; Briggs, Erica <EBriggs@a2gov.org>; Cornell, Jenn <JCornell@a2gov.org>

Subject: Comprehensive Land Use Plan Feedback: PAUSE THE PLAN

Hello Chris and Jon and the Planning Commission,

I am a resident of Ward 2 and am glad that the City is addressing land use issues in the Comprehensive Land Use Plan. However, I am concerned about the draft plan the City is seriously considering.

Having a single zone model for our city is imprudent in my opinion. It would endanger the property values and livability of single family home neighborhoods. It would also create more impermeable hardscape which is unconscionable as we try to maintain an environmentally sustainable city. There would be more run off creating erosion in the watersheds and destroying wildlife. This is not a homogeneous City in terms of what the residents need or want. I do not want developers coming into my neighborhood and building a 4 unit multi-unit residence. Nor should other single family homeowners have to wonder when that is going to happen in their neighborhood.

Ann Arbor is in no way like the cities the plan compares our city to. (Page 47) It is much smaller in land mass and population. It ranks so far down in the population rankings that the comparison is not at all relevant. We are dense enough!

City	Land Square Miles	Water Square Miles	Population	Year	Rank in U.S.	Density/Square Mile
Ann Arbor	28	1	123,851	2020	231	4388.14
Austin	320	7	974,447	2022	33	3006.36
Minneapolis	54	4	429,954	2020	46	2872.40
Portland	133	12	652,503	2020	27	4888.10
Seattle	84	58	737,015	2020	18	8775.03

Source: Wikipedia

At least Austin, Minneapolis, Portland and Seattle have setback requirements. I don't see that in your plan. If those requirements are in there, please alert me to the page number.

I have a friend on the old west side who is adding a big addition onto his home. There is hardly any land exposed on his property and the structure is not at all visually appealing due to the proportions.

But he didn't have to get a variance nor did his neighbor who also has a monstrosity of a garage. No neighbor had to sign off on his addition. So glad I don't live next to him!

So bottom line, the issues that are not clear to me are:

- **Revenue Streams** - The City is clearly trying to find additional revenue streams. Those revenue streams are not going to come from multi-unit housing. I see no budget in the plan that supports a real boost in revenue from these multi-unit structures.
- **Density** - Why do we have to increase density? See above chart.
- **Diversity** - The diversity issue simply doesn't hold water. We are diverse enough. Perhaps not socio-economically diverse but certainly ethnically diverse. We cannot optimize every aspect of diversity.
- **Affordability** - The affordability of the City will not be any better. We approved a **huge housing bond issue** recently. My understanding is that this affordable housing would be on the main corridors. We don't need to have **everyone** live here. We have done our duty by voting for that funding stream.
- **Environmental Concerns, Setbacks and Building Ratios** - There are no apparent setback and building-to-open-land-ratio requirements. This is very concerning from an aesthetic and environmental viewpoint.
- **Business Development** - You do address business development in the Plan. That is where the money is going to come from, not property taxes. You should be spending your time cultivating start-ups from the University, MSU and Wayne State. Not wasting it on creating multi-unit residences within walking distance of services.
- **Transportation** - This simply is a car dependent city. Most people need a car to get to work, the grocery and hardware stores and their doctor. A better transportation system would be nice but most people simply won't use that system. Please don't spend more and more taxpayer dollars on a more expansive transportation system.
- **Outreach** - The outreach for this plan has been abysmal. Three recent open houses which span just 2 weeks? Really? This should be over a month, at the very least. 8 public library open houses total? When? BTW, I just tried to "follow" the project on the A2 website and the tech won't allow me to make an account. Not easy to be a good citizen here. Please schedule more sessions over the course of 2025.

I request a reply from both of you whether you will support this plan and respond to all my concerns listed above. Please Pause the Plan! Thanks.

Babette Levy
2511 Devonshire Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
(847) 707-1344