

**Subject:**

715-717 East Huron Street Rezoning Feedback

---

**From:** Jim Lewis**Sent:** Tuesday, November 18, 2025 9:00 AM**To:** Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>; City Council <CityCouncil@a2gov.org>**Subject:** 715-717 East Huron Street Rezoning Feedback

Dear Planning Commission / City Council:

This property operated as a successful office park for decades. Hobbs & Black and multiple professional tenants occupied the site long term because the land use worked. It delivered predictable daytime activity, low-impact traffic, compatibility with adjacent civic and residential areas, and stable economic value. Nothing about the underlying land use became obsolete. The current vacancy does not reflect a land-use failure—it reflects ownership decisions.

The present owner purchased the property knowing it was regulated as an office complex under a PUD. He also purchased it knowing the PUD existed specifically to prevent speculative residential intensification. After acquisition, rents were set above market, tenants left, and the owner now cites the resulting vacancy as a justification to eliminate the PUD. That is a self-created condition. Zoning decisions cannot be based on private investment miscalculations or deliberate mispricing strategies.

More critically, the applicant is asking for a permanent zoning entitlement with no plan, no site concept, no massing, no circulation study, no infrastructure analysis, and no affordability or public-benefit commitment. The application provides no factual basis, no demonstrated need, and no evidence of public benefit to support the requested change. It is a request to dissolve a PUD—and all its negotiated safeguards—without offering the City anything in return.

Changing zoning without a corresponding project is not “pro-density”; it is blank-check entitling. Once the PUD is removed, the City permanently loses design leverage, compatibility controls, and the ability to negotiate community benefit. The applicant offers no reasons—technical, economic, or planning-based—why the City should forfeit those controls.

A proven, stable office park does not become a candidate for rezoning simply because the newest owner priced it into vacancy. And a zoning change cannot be justified in the absence of any development plan, public benefit, or evidence-based rationale.

There is no basis to approve this request. The existing zoning should remain. Thank you for your consideration.

Jim Lewis