

Subject: Comments on REZ24-0008 — Support for Density, Concern About This Misapplication of TC1

From: Stephanie Kennedy

Sent: Saturday, January 17, 2026 3:21 PM

To: Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>; Lenart, Brett <BLenart@a2gov.org>

Cc: City Council <CityCouncil@a2gov.org>;

Subject: Comments on REZ24-0008 — Support for Density, Concern About This Misapplication of TC1

Dear Mr. Lenart and Members of the Planning Commission,

My name is Stephanie Kennedy, and I live at 1413 Iroquois Place, Ann Arbor MI 48104. I have lived on Iroquois Place for 6 years and I am a lifelong resident of Ann Arbor. I am writing today as someone who strongly supports adding more housing in Ann Arbor. I believe density is good for our climate goals, our affordability goals, and our commitment to welcoming more neighbors into the city.

But density succeeds when it's placed strategically, and REZ24-0008 is a case where the right tool is being applied in the wrong place.

TC1 Is Designed for Corridors — Not Interior Residential Blocks

One of the reasons I support TC1 is because it was created to transform *commercial corridors*. Specifically, places with wide streets, transit frequency, and existing mixed-use patterns, into more walkable, compact, sustainable districts.

But the Woodbury site is not a corridor. It is:

- Well inside a residential superblock
- Surrounded primarily by R1C, R3, and R4 homes
- Served by narrow, internal streets
- Far from the transit frequency TC1 assumes

Using TC1 here works *against* the logic that makes TC1 such an important zoning tool.

The UDC Itself Explicitly Warns Against Rezoning R-Districts to TC1

UDC §5.12.9(B)(1) states that TC1:

"may replace the O, RE, ORL, C2B, C3, P, R5 and M1 districts. It should only replace other zoning designations in unique and rare instances where another zoning district is entirely surrounded by the specifically mentioned districts."

In other words:

TC1 was not meant to replace R-district zoning like R3 or R4 unless the site is fully embedded in commercial or industrial zoning, which Woodbury is not.

The site is surrounded by residential uses on multiple sides. Applying TC1 here contradicts the zoning code's own guidance.

A 7-Story Internal Wall Is Not Good Urbanism

As someone who supports density, I'm concerned that the tallest proposed buildings in this project sit *in the middle* of a neighborhood rather than along a corridor edge.

Successful urban density:

- Steps *up* from existing neighborhoods
- Concentrates height at streets with transit capacity
- Creates a public-facing frontage
- Avoids turning inward or creating internal towers

The proposed 7-story massing creates a vertical wall that doesn't relate to a street, a transit line, or a commercial spine. That's simply not how mid-rise urbanism is supposed to function.

TC1 Brings Commercial Uses By-Right: Unsuitable for This Location

Because TC1 is a **mixed-use** district, it allows by-right uses such as:

- Retail
- Restaurants
- Offices
- Entertainment venues

While mixed-use is great in the right place, adding those uses in the **interior** of a residential superblock would create new traffic and service patterns the surrounding streets weren't designed for.

This rezoning opens the door to future intensification that this location simply cannot support.

The Site Could Support Density, Just Not This Version of It

I fully support more housing on this site. A well-designed **3–4 story development**, especially at the western industrial edge, would:

- Add housing more quickly
- Align with Missing Middle principles
- Minimize displacement pressure
- Fit the street hierarchy
- Avoid the internalized tower effect
- Stay consistent with the UDC's intent for transitions

This kind of density brings people *into* a neighborhood rather than creating a vertical enclave.

Closing

Density is essential, but it also has to be *thoughtful*. TC1 is a powerful tool when used where the ordinance intends it to be used. Applying it here risks undermining public support for the very zoning reforms many of us care deeply about.

I ask the Commission to consider a different approach on this site, one that respects the UDC's intent, maintains good urban design principles, and still brings much-needed homes to Ann Arbor.

Thank you for your work and for considering this perspective from a resident who genuinely wants Ann Arbor to grow and grow wisely.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Kennedy

1413 Iroquois Place Ann Arbor, Mi 48104