

Subject: Comments on CLUP version 4
Attachments: Dabrowski CLUP version 4 still bad.pdf

From: Linda Dabrowski
Sent: Thursday, February 12, 2026 6:50 PM
To: Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>
Cc: Akmon, Dharma <DAkmon@a2gov.org>; Eyer, Jen <JEyer@a2gov.org>; Taylor, Christopher (Mayor) <CTaylor@a2gov.org>
Subject: Comments on CLUP version 4

Hi,

Please include my feedback on the latest version of the comprehensively bad land use plan.

Thank you,
Linda Dabrowski
1202 Brooklyn Ave

I can't decide if the comprehensive plan is funny on purpose or if city officials think residents are stupid.

Public engagement? That's hilarious. The participation numbers are embarrassingly low and consisted of pretty much non-meaningful and performative interaction with people who may or may not even live in the city. Like whose idea was it to have a map of the city where people could decide where they wanted the most density? And that was based on what? Keep the building away from my neighborhood? Using the number of clicks on a website ... 10,000 of those could have been me clicking on the plan ... and that's a click, that's not a response to a question about what a city resident would like to see happen in their neighborhood. The fact that the plan consistently cites data from this "engagement" is ... I guess funny, because the alternative is I guess you think I'm stupid?

(Note that the real public engagement is the feedback that the city received post February 2025 when it was clear to residents what was happening with their neighborhood and surrounding parts of the city. And the majority of that feedback has been negative with residents rightfully expressing concern about how their neighborhood will be impacted.)

Speaking of data, did the city actually survey commuters coming to the city to ask if they actually want to live in Ann Arbor? In a "missing middle" situation like a duplex or triplex or in an ADU? With their family? In a housing unit that may never lead to an ownership opportunity?

The plan is woefully short on specifics, I guess because who needs details? After how well executed the public engagement process has been, it makes perfect sense that residents would be comfortable abdicating important decisions to the city. Details like how exactly will a commercial business be integrated into a residential area? How will multi story multi unit buildings be "consistent with surroundings? What even does that mean? Transition zones next to neighborhoods will be self adjusting? Retail is encouraged along transition zones, but that ignores the fact that along many proposed transition zones - Packard?!? - is full of local businesses that serve nearby residents, and those local businesses will be jeopardized by the taller building heights allowed in transition zones. Oh, and people also live in houses along Packard. What will happen to their home? Does anyone in the city care about how they - current actual taxpaying residents - will be impacted?

Reducing parking minimums sounds like a great idea for streets with more people living in them who need to go to work ... because where will they park their cars? OH, right, they'll take public transportation, because people are already not doing that now, so of course they'll do more of it in the future.

Concerned about residents interested in aging in place? The perfect way to address that is to drive them out of their homes by allowing tall buildings with lots of people to be built next door.

Support neighbors who will be displaced? Well that's already happening as homeowners leave campus neighborhoods because they are terrorized by or tired of student renters throwing loud parties and ignoring neighborhood norms. Think that's hyperbole - I can cite one example this year alone. And feel free to reach out to me to talk about my experience with undergraduate students next door.

Critical thinking about questions like why has missing middle home production declined ... maybe because it's not profitable? No one wants to live in that? Who knows because those important questions aren't answered.

We can already see where zoning exceptions have laid the groundwork for changes proposed in the comprehensive plan. The 10-15 story high rise at the corner of State and Packard seems to have been a zoning exception in preparation for the neighborhood up to Dewey being labeled transition.

Speaking of, the plan assumes all neighborhoods are the same. They are not. Neighborhoods with smaller footprints will be much more appealing to developers who can tear down a single family home and build a multilevel multi tenant building. Is this kind of development actually going to happen in neighborhoods like Ann Arbor Hills?

The plan includes a map of racially restrictive housing covenants from ... 1950s? With a quote from a city council member from ... 1968? What was the intent of including presumably outdated information? More relevant would have been actual instances where minorities have been denied housing in oh, maybe, the current century. As someone who has been vocal on social media about my concerns with the plan, and then, charmingly being called a NIMBY in response, and insinuating that I am somehow interested in promoting harmful practices in the past, I can only assume that the intent was to cast anyone against increased density as a racist?

The plan assumes that increases in housing stock will "ultimately" create affordable housing. I think that's the supply side economics that I'm willing to bet our Democratic council would have been violently opposed to during the Reagan years ... and we've seen how well that theory has worked out well in practice. But good news, wealthy out of state alumni and wealthy out of state parents will have even more choices in where to purchase homes for their students or to have a weekend place to watch football games.

The plan does not address how necessary infrastructure improvements will be funded. I mean honestly, I could go on and on. The bottom line, besides not getting the joke, is that the city is proposing wholesale changes to city neighborhoods without engaging city residents. I for one am not opposed to making existing residences in my neighborhood affordable. I am vehemently opposed to creating any more residences in my neighborhood. There is neither space nor infrastructure.

I oppose the comprehensive plan. Oh, and I'm not stupid.

Linda Dabrowski
1202 Brooklyn Avenue
Ann Arbor city resident and homeowner since 1997