

Subject: Comprehensive plan

From: Bill Bradley

Sent: Thursday, July 17, 2025 12:22 PM

To: Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>; City Council <CityCouncil@a2gov.org>

Subject: Re: Comprehensive plan

Hi all,

I just wanted to write (again) in support of the CLUP. I appreciate that both council and planning commission are giving residents the time and space to voice their concerns about the CLUP. But I'd also like to express my frustration with the entire Pause the Plan movement—and their extremely vocal supporters—for a few reasons.

- The visibility they have and the press they get—when I say "press" I mean articles by reporters in the newspaper, not Nextdoor—is completely disproportionate. For example: They have yard signs opposing something that has been in the works for many years and the loudest dissenters who say that no one knew this was coming damn well knew it was and are simply arguing in bad faith because they do not want—and have never wanted—change. Simple as that. What am I supposed to do, put out an *"I voted for people who said they were gonna rezone the city during the last city council election and they wiped out all the candidates who campaigned against it"* sign? I said it in my previous email and I discuss it with my friends and neighbors regularly: *You have a mandate*. Everything else is just noise from the same malcontents that have been gumming up city government since before I even lived here. I would come to City Council and Commission meetings to voice support and/or argue with the folks—again, THE SAME PEOPLE—who oppose the policies you campaigned on, but I sadly do not have the time. This is what I voted for—and you all won *convincingly*.
- Please do not water down this proposal just to appease a vocal minority. Sure, let them complain. But it says nowhere in the city charter that you have to listen. A bunch of people—a huge majority!!—voted for you. I think that dropping the height from four to three stories is more than enough of an olive branch. The conversations I'm having with folks is that we'd like to see some sort of protections—and I realize this may come later, after the CLUP (hopefully) goes through—around the types of entities that can purchase lots and develop on them. The big fear among my friends (all A2 residents!) is that homes—in particular the aging supply of single-family homes—will be gobbled up by private equity and shell companies. We don't want that. Developers? Fine! Property management companies? Fine! Family-run businesses? Even better. But private equity is evil—yet smart and shrewd—and they will see A2's aging SFH housing stock, (finally, hopefully) relaxed zoning code, and growing UofM enrollment as an opportunity to squeeze every last drop of juice out of the market. *That* is my concern—not duplexes and low-rise apartment buildings in neighborhoods that ... already have duplexes and low-rise apartment buildings.
- While I have you, can we seriously consider going to the mat with the University? I understand the fear of killing the golden goose, etc. But they keep gobbling up property and even if the

CLUP increases the tax base, my taxes continue to go up every year. The University is an insanely large and profitable—monolithic!—business. Yes, it provides jobs. Yes, it's a community hub. They also have a massive endowment, an athletic department that prints money, and a growing student population that pays ungodly sums in tuition. I know that the regents and the University will *never* pay taxes. But I think it's time to seriously consider getting them into a PILOT. I don't care if they pay for snow removal or sewer services or whatever. If they gave the city even a million bucks annually—a drop in the goddamn bucket for them—it would have a dramatic impact on the city and the city's general fund, not to mention be a gesture of good faith (that the regents would surely love to grandstand on). I also think it would be a very popular issue among every voter in the city.

Keep fighting the good fight! Thanks for all the great work you do in attempting to make the city a more welcoming and affordable place—I know we'll get there.

Talk soon,
Bill

On Sun, Mar 30, 2025 at 2:15 PM Bill Bradley wrote:

Hello,

I live in Ward 5 and I just wanted to write **in support of** the comprehensive plan. In general, I would like to see less headway on the buses (right now the infrequency makes it difficult for some folks to take the bus) and more density — and to give builders, developers, contractors, whoever more leeway to just ... build. It's way too difficult to build anything now because it invariably ends up in some stupid litigation from someone who think it *ruins the character of Ann Arbor*.

The thing I find most frustrating is how the same (small) vocal minority shows up to every City Council hearing to gum up the works of progress towards more density, more housing, an Ann Arbor that works for everyone. Don't listen to them. City Council has a mandate after the last election and you have the full support of the majority of voters — this guy included!

More TC1, more ADUs, more duplexes, more apartment buildings, let people open coffee shops in the neighborhood. One thing I am frustrated with is just how quickly the university is building the dorm on Hill not far from my house. But if we wanted to do that as a city it would get mired in Council because, again, the same people would show up and complain. Let's make it legal and easier for folks to build more housing so it's not caught in a constant state of limbo, city council assessment, and dubious legal filings that discourage developers from building in the A2 market.

More than anything, what we've *been doing* for decades isn't working. So, please, do not listen to the detractors: Let's build.

Thanks,
Bill

--

[Bill Bradley](#) | co-founder [Three Point Four Media](#) | p: 231-944-9080

--

[Bill Bradley](#) | co-founder [Three Point Four Media](#) | p: 231-944-9080