

Subject:

DC-3: Please Vote No

From: Gregg Saldutti Jr
Sent: Saturday, July 19, 2025 3:42 PM
To: City Council <CityCouncil@a2gov.org>
Cc: Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>
Subject: DC-3: Please Vote No

Council Members,

TLDR:

Please don't delay this plan.

Please don't limit housing options.

Please vote No.

I would like to thank you for your work in cooperation with the Planning Commission's ongoing update to the Comprehensive Land Use Plan. I particularly appreciate those members who are actively working to dispel misinformation regarding the plan, as well as other development issues in the city- namely Proposals A and B on the upcoming election.

However, I am disappointed with the resolution you are voting on today. While I understand the need to weigh the diverse voices of the city, I do not think that this resolution achieves that.

I urge you to vote no on 25-1371.

It seems that this resolution aims to compromise with a very vocal minority of people in the city, but which will not actually achieve compromise in any meaningful sense.

On one side of this issue, we see a diverse group of residents- renters and homeowners, young and old, students, professionals and retirees- all working to envision a future where the city is able to achieve not just equity in housing, but also many of the stated aims of those opposed to development, namely environmental protection, reduced traffic through higher shares of transit use and active mobility, more economic diversity and access to essential goods in neighborhoods and downtown.

On the other side, we have a homogenous group composed primarily of wealthy, white homeowners. In public comment and in the social media environment, this group does not seem to have a future vision, but is driven by the singular desire that things shan't change.

In much of the discourse we see misinformation being spread by many in opposition to this plan: we see the undermining of trusted public institutions, such as the Council and AADL (so much so that the AADL was compelled to [dispel the misinformation](#)); we see language meant to define those opposed to this plan as "real citizens" of Ann Arbor- or those who belong- against those in support as either marginal, or people who have not yet earned their right to be heard. But, by now we should recognize their stale

arguments- too much traffic, ruins neighborhood character, raises our taxes- because they have been using them for the [past 50 years](#).

We can also look to academic literature to remind us that these voices are not actually representative of the communities they purport to represent, even if they define themselves as the 'real citizens'. In the work *Neighborhood Defenders*, the authors explore how participants in public comment hold disproportionately negative views on issues of land use and are made up of disproportionately wealthy, disproportionately white and disproportionately property owning people. The authors conclude that this structural issue works to exacerbate the issue of housing inequality.

This is unfortunate because proponents of this plan have articulated a future for inclusive growth in Ann Arbor, and have engaged with facets of the plan in good faith.

We have heard from many privileged homeowners that they would like to see denser development around them, even if it affects their own home values.

We have heard stories of individuals buying single family homes that otherwise might prefer to live in condos, taking those opportunities away from families that might otherwise have had them.

We have heard from renters burdened by rising rents and lack of incentive for their landlords to address issues with their properties.

We have heard from young people who work in education or health care, describe how they would like to live in the city, but simply can't afford it, or cannot find the type of housing that would fit their needs.

Moving beyond the merits of the two sides presented in the broader discourse, **I don't believe that this resolution will accomplish the compromise that it purports to.** This body has already asked the Planning Commission to limit building heights in residential zones, but that has not stopped the misinformation about building heights next to single family homes. We have seen many opponents to the plan take issue not just with density in neighborhoods, but also 'high rises' in the core and what will be transition zones- the logic being that gentle density is OK, but high density development is undesirable.

However, by **preemptively limiting units in neighborhood zones we lose any possibility of gentle density that some opponents nominally support.** The only option this leaves us is to build up in the zones where it is allowed. But, we can see from past and current discourse on this issue that this is something that opponents to this plan won't tolerate either. We see it everytime there is a proposed development downtown, and 'compromising' on neighborhood limits will not change that reality. We also know that there are different economics at play between smaller mutli-plex buildings and larger apartment buildings, potentially undercutting housing affordability issues and severely limiting housing types in the city. **It also severely restrains any sort of incremental development and housing variety that would be possible otherwise.**

Gentle density- allowing more than triplex developments in the neighborhoods- IS the compromise solution. This resolution is not the way.

Please don't delay this plan.

Please don't limit housing options.

Please vote No.

Thank you,

Gregg Saldutti
Renter
Ward 5