

Subject: Comments on draft 4 of the CLUP

From: Mary Durfee
Sent: Tuesday, February 10, 2026 5:55 PM
To: Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>
Subject: Comments on draft 4 of the CLUP

Dear Planning Commission members,

I would like to comment on the fourth and final draft of the CLUP in 3 specific areas:

1. Infrastructure
2. Metrics
3. Borders between zones

1. **Infrastructure.** I would like to thank the Planning Commission for the changes that were made to p130 as it regards Utility Systems. It is a subtle, but, in my mind, important change.

2. **Metrics.** I would like to address the metrics identified in 3 areas:

- a. **Goal #1 under Housing and Neighborhoods** - Increase the supply and diversify the types of housing for households of different sizes, abilities, and income levels. The only identified metric is University of Michigan student enrollment. Since addressing the missing middle is a major identified goal of the CLUP, I think that the metric needs to be more robust and address more than the University of Michigan student enrollment. It would seem that tracking city income levels, median sale prices of homes, percent of residents who work in AA, median rentals, occupancy rates could be more appropriate.
- b. **Goal #4 under Housing and Neighborhoods** - Encourage walkable, connected neighborhoods with access to basic needs and amenities. The only metric is number of ACUs and commercial businesses in residential; number of new units near bus stop/walk score. This is an important metric to track. However, given the discussion that I heard over the last 18 mos, I would suggest adding some degree of clarity to the types of businesses opened and their relative importance to the demographic that the city is trying to attract. For example, affordable groceries, daycares, hardware stores, etc.
- c. **Goal #12.1.3 under Infrastructure and Services** – Align implementation of the Future Land Use Map with investments in water/sewer conveyance and treatment capacity to support more growth of the city. The metric for all of section 12 is number of public and private EV chargers; tonnes of waste per capita. Both of these metrics are valuable and measure what we would like to see happen. It is also important to follow the number of infrastructure failures – or what we hope doesn’t happen – those unintended negative consequences of an action. I call these balancing metrics. For example, number of

flooding episodes, sewer backups. The city staff would have a better knowledge of the best measures to follow than would I but I think that they are important to track.

3. **Borders between zones.** As I have reviewed the most recent map on p 115, I note that sometimes the borders between zones are along city streets and sometimes they are not. I understand the challenge of consistency in this regard, particularly the borders between transitional zones and residential zones. For example, I notice that in the current draft of the plan, the east side of South Forest between Granger and Cambridge Road is slightly touched by the Transitional zone marking. In previous drafts, the division was along the street, where the west side of the street had been transitional and the east side had been residential. Overall, I believe that it makes more sense in heavily populated residential areas, such as this one, that the change occur at the street level, rather than in the backyards between those on South Forest and those on Olivia. This avoids having structures of significantly different heights right next to each other (where, for example, a tall dwelling on the east side of Forest casts a shadow on close-by houses on Cambridge Court, Minerva, or Horman). I notice that this occurs in a number of other areas in the city.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment. Thanks for your work on this important document.

Mary Durfee

1052 Olivia Ave