

From: Ann Arbor Renter's Commission <RentersCommission@a2gov.org>
Sent: Thursday, February 12, 2026 6:03 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Please don't pass a resolution of support for the CLUP

[REDACTED]

Thanks for this email, it will be provided to the Renters Commission tomorrow with their agenda packet for their 2/19 meeting next week. Thanks!

Kristen Vander Lugt, Deputy Clerk - Operations (she/her/hers)

Ann Arbor City Clerk's Office | Guy C. Larcom City Hall | 301 E. Huron, 2nd Floor · Ann Arbor · MI

Direct dial (734) 794-6140 Ext. 41404

kvanderlugt@a2gov.org | www.a2gov.org

Follow the Clerk's Office on Instagram [@a2cityclerk](https://www.instagram.com/a2cityclerk)

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 11, 2026 6:20 PM
To: Ann Arbor Renter's Commission <RentersCommission@a2gov.org>
Subject: Please don't pass a resolution of support for the CLUP

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

This message was sent from outside of the City of Ann Arbor. Please do not click links, open attachments, or follow directions unless you recognize the source of this email and know the content is safe.

Renters commissioners:

I appreciate your effective advocacy for tenants, resulting in the Right to Renew, Early Leasing and Junk Fee ordinances, all of which I support.

The CLUP seeks to increase housing but will not improve the affordability of Ann Arbor's rental housing. The supply of modestly priced housing will be reduced because that is the housing that will be torn down and replaced by more expensive housing. This will accelerate the price increases for the more modest segment of the market for both renters and owners. The CLUP should not incentivize the loss of existing attainably priced housing and instead protect tenants from displacement.

I recommend that you do not approve a resolution to endorse the Comprehensive Land Use Plan at your 2/12/26 meeting. At a minimum, this vote should be postponed.

Why is this resolution premature?

1. The Plan goes to Planning Commission for a vote on 2/18/26. While it is likely they will approve it, the vote has not been taken yet and the opportunity for changes exists.
2. City council also has yet to vote on it. They will hold a public hearing, have a public deliberation, and a vote (likely 2/16/26, but perhaps a little later). City Council will vote to adopt the plan as is or reject it and send it back to planning commission with recommendations for changes. There will be a lot of citizen input between now and then, lots of letters to council members, and some in-person meetings are likely to occur.
 - Will that input lead to council asking for planning commission to change the plan?
 - How would those changes impact the renters commissioners' opinions?
 - Would the renters commission prefer to use that time to make its own recommendations to city council? I recommend doing this.
 - What other commissions have passed a similar resolution of support? I am not aware of any.

A couple things that were raised by commissioners at the last meeting indicate that the plan's impacts are not completely understood.

1. Commissioner Ratcliff mentioned that there will still be PUDs, providing affordable housing. The problem is that we will lose that community benefit with the CLUP. PUDs trade upzoning for affordable housing. The plan gives away that upzoning for free, without the affordable housing. We can already see that loss in a plan headed for approval at city council a month from now. It is going to be in the Hub land use category, so rather than being upzoned with a PUD which would provide over thirty units of affordable housing, it will be upzoned to D1 with zero affordable housing for the very same building. This is being done presuming the outcome of the CLUP. Once the CLUP is adopted, we will see this same loss of effectiveness of PUDs, with many units of affordable housing lost on similar projects.
2. Commissioner Rasouli mentioned the removal of height exceptions on page 138. The discussion that followed made it evident that this is not clearly understood.

The language on page 138, 1.3.4, reads: "Remove the height exceptions in the Residential Category to minimize adverse shading impacts on adjacent properties."

What does this mean? As Ken Garber and I explained at the last meeting, there is an option in our zoning code that allows for a 30% height increase in exchange for a community benefit of either sustainability or affordability. Removing this "height exception" will not be helpful to "minimize adverse shading impacts on adjacent properties" because it has been combined with another change that will allow the same height currently achievable with this "height exception" bonus to be achieved, after the CLUP passes, WITHOUT the community benefit. The affordable housing benefit and sustainability benefit will be lost. We gain no effective limit in heights, but lose everything in the community benefits currently required in trade to achieve that bonus height.

The CLUP is highly flawed, particularly in affordability. These are but two examples, raised by commissioners at the last meeting, that require additional understanding by not just the commission but also the public at large.

There will be a resident-led community gathering to discuss Draft 4 of the CLUP on Sunday 2/15/26 from 1-3pm at the big barn at Cobblestone Farm. Please join your neighbors there for

an informative conversation, lots of questions and answers, including a discussion of the above items and much more.

Thank you,

██████████