

**Future Land Use Map**  
**April and May Open House Sessions Summary**  
*May 13, 2025*

With close to 200 comments received for the Future Land Use Map exercise (conducted only in person), concentrations of comments fell spatially in the areas below. Each of these areas' comments were reviewed and summarized.

**1. Burns Park (Residential District)**  
*15 Comments*

Many residents in Burns Park are concerned that the changes from the Comprehensive Plan will decrease the desirability of their neighborhood. In general, most comments were supportive of duplexes and acknowledged that these smaller multifamily homes fit the current look and feel of the neighborhood but were unconvinced that larger structures would be visually appropriate in Burns Park. A few residents also raised concerns regarding setbacks, suggesting that multiplex developments would encroach on neighbors' privacy.

**2. Miller Road (Transition District)**  
*8 Comments*

All comments received by residents in this area expressed opposition to classifying Miller as a transition corridor, regardless of the resident's support for the general goals and strategies of the Plan as a whole. Height limits were the primary area of concern, especially in relation to potential negative impacts on aesthetics, property values, and solar panel usage. One resident also expressed concern regarding traffic and road maintenance.

**3. Flex District**  
*8 Comments*

Some residents in this district expressed confusion regarding what kind of district they were located in, where the boundary lines were, and what the consequences of the changes would be. A few comments highlighted specific concerns, including infrastructural challenges associated with densification and the risk of displacement of local businesses. One resident suggested that a transition corridor, rather than a flex district, would be a more appropriate strategy in this area.

#### **4. Plymouth-Nixon Corridor (Hub District)**

*11 Comments*

Opinions in this area were mixed. Several comments expressed excitement about becoming a hub, highlighting benefits such as walkability, better transit, and more dining options. On the opposing side, many comments expressed concern that prioritizing growth would harm the character of the neighborhood (and Ann Arbor as a whole). Others cited infrastructural and environmental challenges and concerns about reduced drivability as reasons for their opposition to the plan. Notably, across both pro-hub and anti-hub groups, a consistent theme was the need to balance new development with greenspace preservation.