

Number	Address	Map Notes
1	N State	I like: 1. Allowing more density, including in low-rise residential. I dislike: The Flex District, restrictions on housing anywhere, and active-use requirements on first floors. Thanks! I also support uncapping height limits in transition.
3	Traver	Howley Court, Longshore, Swift, West Side of Wright Street should NOT be Transition District, but should be Residential
4	S State	For Brett Lenart - Pl send list of projects under approval & names of Architects / Civil Engineers sjain@imsi-pm.com
5	Woodlawn	Your goals have specific, concrete impacts on specific areas - I do <u>not</u> see these mapped or transparently indicated. The written presentation is (purposefully?) vague. If you want to do some thing specific and want our approval - ask - otherwise - I disapprove of your blanket proposal for (blank check) change.
6	Woodlawn	You mention that there are a large number of commuters & they provide a work free and business for the city - why make it hard for them to drive in?
7	Woodlawn	4 story residential buildings should NOT be built next to 2 1/2 story-established single family homes. Nor should they have McMansion footprints.
8	Woodlawn	The intent and impact of your survey in the past was unclear; I did not participate. Now that the extent of your goals is more clear - CONDUCT MORE SURVEYS.
10	Woodlawn	Packard Ro is a mess now. Too congested. Please do NOT add high raises -- it's becoming unbearable. Killing local
12	Traver	Traver Street across from Leslie Science & Nature Center up to the Golf Course should be Low Rise Residential NOT
13	Olivia	Burns Park should remain single (detached) and duplex housing only. No commercial businesses.
14	Traver	Please do NOT make Traver Rd Transitional. It's a Haven con birds + it is Ann Arbor's "backyard."
15	Agincourt	Concordia "Transition Zone" is a bad idea. The current owners are in Winsconsin and will not share Ann Arbor values when they sell. They'll sell it to the highest bidder... gas stations, commercial, light industry etc. They are content to hold on to the property as long as needed to accomplish their end goal of extracting as much money from it as possible. These are not good
17	Traver	Let's guess that NPR STRs want to be permitted in the low rise residential district. Will they be permitted in the Transition District. The area near the Athletic campus would be particularly "appealing"/vulnerable
18		Let's not add more luxury student apartments to takeover existing great neighborhoods South of OWS historic district.
19	Pauline	find there is little enthusiasm for "gentle density" in what are Ann Arbor's single family home neighborhoods. Fill in the density corridors first and leave Ann Arbors historical neighborhoods alone. I've always voted for additional property tax millages but there is limit to what we can pay. JLM.

20	Crosby Crescent	<p>Even tho the planning commission has been working on the CL Draft for 2 years (read this I nthe CP!), I have many like myself unaware of public engagement moments, surveys etc. I would have loved to participate but not notified thro mail, email etc. I didn't know I had to opt into these sort of city notices. I don't frequent big events in town due to husband w/ cancer. I feel the city was not surveyed to ask their opinions to assess an appropriate % of the popularity.</p> <p>I realize change is inevitable but doing it in such big way jamming it thro + down our throats is unacceptable, disrespectful</p> <p>Also, we have solar in a single story ranch neighborhood. a 4story building no matter how positioned on the land will block m solar. I don't feel I can trust the city of AA council, planning commission to have my best interest in mind, or of our neighborhood. The folks have not communicated but to those they only wished to do so. Many of us receive email bills for taxes, water - send communications out via this mechanism! I read in the draft that 54% of AA residents are over 55 yrs old - maybe these folks are not so computer savey, use social media?? Smells of ageism to me.</p>
21	Fairview	<p>Intersection of Stadium & Maple</p> <p>this is very pedestrian bicycle unfriendly</p> <p>undermines the landuse proposal to make this area a <u>hub</u>.</p>
22	Woodlawn	<p><u>NO</u> three or four story "houses" in Burns Park. <u>TOO</u> dense now - proximity to campus would make it a haven for students who are NOT invested in our neighborhoods</p> <p>Too dense right now - our street is too narrow for 2-way traffic. <u>NO</u> to <u>3-4 story residential</u></p>
25	E Stadium	<p>Key words:</p> <p>plan for people:</p> <p>family formation etc.</p> <p>state constitutionally independent (UM)</p> <p>resource conservation through <u>preservation</u></p> <p>neighborhoods for all ages</p> <p>community sustaining</p>
26		<p>not 147-page plan... should less than be 47 pages, less cartoons; more transparent data (and less)</p> <p>Too much jargon; very wordy</p>
27		<p>You planning commision folks and city council folk would not like a 3 story building next to your homes located adjacent to parks or in Burns Park, but you don't care about others.</p>
28	Olivia	<p>Thank you for moving the mixed use line to the West Side of Au Fore This allows all of (???) to be in the lower yard.</p>
29	White	<p>Please stop Heidis monopoly</p> <p>\$\$\$ a la Elon</p>
30		<p>Stop repeating the unfounded # for # of commuters! 80,000 ? Not realistic - what is the sources?</p>
32	Brooks	<p>How about limiting what the University can purchase so they stop taking 10k or more students who "need" housing - some of us have lived here over 50 years - I bought on a bus route in residential <u>not to</u> have apartments next door!</p>

Future Land Use Map Comments - 4/24/25 at Westgate Library and 4/30/25 at Mallets Creek Library

33	Ardenne	Draft plan needs much more guide lines on form based standards to direct approval of future houses.
35		I dont believe that zoning should be eliminated because rich out of town developers are already running the city where they
36	Archwood	Love hubs and transitions. Thank you for thinking about our housing crisis. Residential - yes building up to 4 stories. Love it!
37	White	At a minimum, street names should be provided - at IE boundary streets for various zones!
38	Felch	Miller Road (Transition corridor) runs behind my
39	Felch	My property/home abuts homes on Miller Ave. Should the Comp. Plan be approved with 4-7 story bldgs allowed on Miller there will be a 7 story bldg directly next to my home. This is outrageous planning. I would not object to 3 stories. I bought my home 1 year ago. I found no info. concerning the comp. plan. I expect that I will move if this plan comes to fruition. At great cost - to move, and also likely (loss) in value of my home. So I, who pay \$30k yearly in city taxes, will suffer. It's not a fair situation. I am sensitive to the issues - willing to compromise - but here we are. (I am a recent widow with a son with cystic fibrosis)
40	Red Oak	What are plans for "provide supports" (Strategy 2.1) What actions are being considered?
41	Allison	What are you plans to support/protect those who live in or next to areas designated to be densified? Those who have lived here for years do not want to live in a downtown "hub," but many cannot not afford (and do not want) to move elsewhere in the city,
42	Barber	I like the idea of a hub, around the Maple/Stadium area!
43	Red Oak	The impact of the Miller and Packard transition districts cannot be understood without lots more detail.
44	Georgetown	The houses in my neighborhood are very close together. We frequently have to go on our neighborhords property to access our backyard. How are you going to address this if you allow building closer to the lot line?
45		Please move the mixed use transition zone <u>up</u> from woodlawn to dewey to respect the longstanding configuration of the lobupa neighborhood because we are south of the 5-corner packard/state neighborhood we are not protected by the gradual height adjustment that is supposed to help other transition neighborhoods - ie we can get a huge development right next door. Our great community will be broken (and your goal is community?) This plan is too aggressive given it is ALSO defined to PRIORITIZE FLEXIBILITY for planners + developers.
46	Las Vegas	Love it. I can't wait to have more density and mixed use along the W. Stadium corridor, within an easy walk. I hope to see good connections into my neighborhood.
47	Lowell	What does this plan do to (???) Ann Arborites who want to preserve the look/feel + density of their current neighborhoods?
48	Dartmoor	I want to be able to find housing/transit that fits me & my fmaily through all stages of life -> I don't want to give up my neighborhood if I don't want the house more housing more neighbords more business more Ann Arbor

49	Manor	I am concerned about the transition zone north of Barton. There are few high buildings that will affect the character of the neighborhood. Traffic is constant & will this be managed with more planned development? Is a developer identified, and do they have a local stake? I am concerned there is no plan to preserve not only open green but also trees. I understand there is a desire for mixed use,
50	S Revena	Dislikes - <u>everything</u> increased taxes, density, noise & lights This should change from no increased density in established residential neighborhoods. I have lived in residential density for 40 yrs. On our cul-de-sac, there are 9 houses + 5 duplexes w/ minimum off street parking serves a minimum of 4 cars per duplex = 20 cars. 3 bins per duplex total bins 27, cars 15+ visitors; 3 where allied = 9 bins + minimum of Lear.
52	Paul	Please Stop. You are ruining Ann Arbor. Period.
53	Sequoia	I like the transit corridors as a focus for more/higher housing. I don't like the "grey" areas being tampered with. Also, don't mess with Westgate.
54	Hanover	Property has been subdivided into 3 - but there seems to be an issue selling the other 2 properties. (Tall one built looks like it just has a huge front yard.) How does the city plan to fill tall? I (???) if (???) plan is for a developer to densify - taley salowed build all 3 + stop worrying about customieazion.
55	Granger	Residential zone proposed should stay R1-2 or possibly 3 but do not get rid of set-backs on front, sides, backs. We want yards
56	Hermitage	I'm concerned about 4 story buildings being built in the middle of individual residential housing. Street parking is already crowded. . . a multi-unit building would bring many parking issues.
57	S Ashley	Please consider further expanding the opportunities for ADUs, especially in the HUB district (e.g. increased square footage allowed, reduced setback, street parking allowed vs. on site)
58	Arbordale	Develop part of Slauson Field behind Slauson for "cottage court" or 3 story quadplexes. Do the same fwith Fuller Field (or part), Burns Part (part of)
59	Stone School	Traffic is already heavy and dangerous on Stone School (esp, but not only, in rush hour). Crosswalks are ignored for pedestrian safety. What are plans to improve this if density of population is also increased? I suggest a light at Mill Creek and the flashing lights at our crosswalks.
61	Cranbrook	"Gentle Density"? A bit Orwellian, aren't we?

Future Land Use Map Comments - 4/24/25 at Westgate Library and 4/30/25 at Mallets Creek Library

62	Cardinal	I do not like this. I have serious concerns about the proposed "transition district" located along Packard immediately adjacent to Mary Beth Doyle Park. My backyard is currently shaded yellow as part of this district; the property is currently owned by a church, and I'm concerned that the City will strong arm the church into selling this land. My neighbors and I steward these woods. I've paid to cable trees to protect the habitat, planted a native garden, fed the birds, watched the deer, rabbits, squirrels, raccons, and other wildlife - all to have it razed and built on ??? Tanatamount to evicting me from my home, because I will leave. So will my neighbors - most of us bought our homes for these woods and wildlife. What aobut my property value? What about runoff into Mallett's Creek? What aobut the traffic congestion? This is a poorly thought out plan. I will spread the
63	Arborview	This area is stable/improving residential. Children walk and bike to school. I walked to work at the U, as did many others in the neighborhood. Traffic on Miller is at the max now, with a good bus route. Adding more apartments/condos to the area wound not work. Meanwhile I wish more effort and money was being spent on improving the roads in Ann Arbor.
64	Brockman	This plan is a fantasy - lots of assumptions relative to why something is good and will happen. It's like the ADU program - solve housing and affordability hardly any built. But developers, real estate lawyers, and buildings must be salivating. We're going to end up with a lot of high rise, expensive condos - and those people are going to own a couple of cars. And don't tell me I
65	Pine Valley	777 Property Development - Parking is necessary to making area vibrant and desirable to existing neighborhoods nearby; Promising development if done right.
66	Manchester	This is a 60 year old neighborhood (or at IE my house is). I don't want multiplexes, duplexes in the middle of neighborhood, but along edges of Washtenaw, Packard I could live with.
68	Glendaloch	This is more of a general comment about the process of developing the plan. I , along with many other residents, feel very left out of the process. Without a regular newspaper, I feel that the opportunity to receive information on an ongoing basis has been extremely limited. Even looking at the slide that explains the level of engagement shows what I feels is very limited opportunities of the average citizen for a plan that has the potential for such drasting revisions in our city.
69	Sunset	I understand and support increased density, but do not support changing existing neighborhoods. One of the goals is supporting entrepreneurs but that is not what we have seen from Council to date. Instead most of the independent businesses are gone, replaced by chains. I don't see the City doing anything to protect what they say is an important goal. They also indicate support for natural public spaces but that is not included in this plan and in any housing development to date, except for UM housing. Example Food Coop. I appreciate this forum to share the plan. However, I do not think anything will change based on public comment. City Council votes as one block with no diversity of opinion. I have yet to see public input have any influence on plans. I definitely support affordable housing although the plan never says what that is. And to date a ton of housing has been built and none of it is affordable. One unit is being built (4th avenue) but that is it. Also, I suspect every City Council person and the Mayor live in single family neighborhoods and many will not be affected by this plan.
70	Glendale	The major/problem challenge is the large UM tax-exempt land acreage. It is a mistake to disrupt family neighborhoods with "high density" housing willy nilly. People like + want neighborhoods with single family housing

71	Traver	The south side of Woodlawn is proposed as low rise residential; the north side is transition. It is more than 50' away, so the stepdown from 80' to 55' would not apply & the northside of Woodlawn would be 80' (assuming these numbers hold from what
72	Traver	Dewey can be like the South Main Street "Canyon" Not desirable
74	Miner	Why weren't postcards about the comp. plan mailed to all residents last year so we could have a voice & participate? Please hold off on approving this plan so we can express our ideas and work together for the benefit of all. Thank you.
77	Lowell	Please be more transparent about how aggressive land use changes (have beneficiaries) other cities - and just how many homes can be built on 1/2 acre plots
78	Spring	We do not know how a new comprehensive plan will work out. Especially if all neighborhoods are available to multi-family buildings. This is such a radical plan from the status quo, that I consider it too risky to make this change over the entire city. I propose that we see how this goes in some neighborhoods. Then, we see what works well and what needs changes. It's too large a leap to radically change every residential lot in A2. Since city council, and the planning commission, represent all areas of the city, I say that we choose the neighborhoods where they live as the ones to see how the new comprehensive plan goes. As for the 3 story (35') or 4 story (48') limit, I strongly feel 3 stories should be the max. Otherwise, many homes will lose sunlight entering their windows much of the year. That would be unhealthy for people's mental health. And would make solar power much more difficult for many, if not impossible for some. Many of us feel moving more deliberately is crucial to ultimate
79		what success/effectiveness have previous plans had... does the plan help to respond to adverse conditions? [does the \$\$ (???) gather dust on the shelf (what prevents that)]
81	Brockman	The proposed plan doesn't have enough facts + details that would justify this proposed level of density!
82	Beechwood	I recognize that we need more housing. My concern is that if tall buildings are allowed close to my property, my solar panels will not get enough sun. Also, I'm afraid that luxury home, even more expensive ones will be built around me, raising the
83	Kimberely	Transition that abut residential will alter the fundamental nature of neighborhoods. Apartments and condos do not lend themselves to enduring relationships necessary to family friendly.
84	Lennox	A) Residential should be 3 stories max; B) More Flex zone E? 1)Note: planning should consider A2 only! Not entire county and 2) Note: Goal should not be to increase A2 population but to hold steady at ~130k and instead concentrate on providing designated lower income housing opportunities within the City. Thank you for your work.
85	Dorchester	New construction where lampost Inn was needs a solid short-term parking solution. The Trader Joe's lot cannot take potential
86	Fountain	I support the recommendations of the plan with 1 exception. Miller Avenue is identified as "Transition District" and is the only collector in AA with that designation. All other corridors with a "Transition" recommendation are arterials and major arterials. Why is Miller included with the corridors identified as appropriate for "Bus Rapid Transit" or "Priority Bus Service?" Miller is a collector, like Liberty, Scio Church, Pontiac Trail, Geddes, Pauline, and Dexter and is the only collector identified for "Transition District" designation. Miller isn't an arterial, major arterial, or commercial corridor. It's a residential neighborhood street like Liberty, Pontiac Trail and all the other collectors.

87	Marlborough	This plan should change. Why are the existing natural features mast plan omitted and no specific protections specified? The population is declining yet info provided claims it is increasing.
88	Marlborough	Looks like my home that is zoned R1 is according to your map my house is labeled Flex. What???
89	Ivywood	I would like to see a Transition Zone here because it's bordering a residential zone. The Stadium Hub zone makes sense on the west side of Stadium and closer to Liberty.
90	Marlborough	I like my relatively quiet, friendly neighborhood. I do not want it to become crowded, and lose street parking spaces. I'm fearful developers will buy houses because they are less expensive than other areas.
91	Kimberley	Transition zone is one block from my house. Noise, traffic, congestion would greatly increase; lowering the quality of life for Kimberley Hills. It would result in paving, sidewalks, street lights, traffic, etc.
92	Linda Vista	The lot on Washington across from the A2 YMCA should be protected for housing service workers and the affordable, earning less than \$50,000 per household.
93	Coler	Iroquis should not be moved to a "transition" zoning. Yes, it's along an arterial, but it's a quite residential neighborhood that 7 story apartments wouldn't fit in
94	Brooklyn	What is "low-rise" for a residential neighborhood? Please don't make low-rise equal 3 stories or God forbid, 4 stories. We aren't Chicago - we're a small university town. Let not densify just to densify.
101	Olivia	Regarding R1/R2 - There has to be restrictions on the size of residential buildings added to single family neighborhoods. A duplex like the ones at the corner of Cambridge and Baldwin fits. A 3 story box does not. Aesthetics matter! If "anything goes" the beauty that makes the neighborhood desirable is gone and no one will want to be there. Consider limits as to how many duplexes can be built on one block. What is the price point goal to make it "affordable"? Is it \$200k? 500k? 800k? Whatever it is, is that really going to be achieved?
102		Please refrain R1/R2 neighborhoods. They are the reason so many want to live in Ann Arbor. More housing can be built further out - provide good transport into and around town. Problem solved.
103	Forest Creek	Encouraging high density with no parking requirements is foolish. E.g. Downtown Seattle is a mess, businesses are leaving. Ann Arbor is trying to implement what Seattle already did.
104	Forest Creek	The Ride needs to be pushed to add service. Residents will not abandon cars until the bus is actually an attractive alternative.
106	Woodlawn	Historic property needs to be protected as is. My historic home is not in a historic district but is historically significant. It is important to look at what is in the zone.
107	Olivia	Zoning should not change for the Burns Bark neighborhood! R1 or R2. A blanket proposal for the entire town does not make sense. Where are the "daylight" restrictions? Where is the increased/improved infrastructure? Where is the parking for the elderly? This "plan" is not "comprehensive" it is destructive with no long term benefits.
108	Anderson	Appreciate 3 story cap. Thank you. Concern about setbacks, don't want new structures up to sidewalk. Like duplex/triplex/ADU (w/parking available on site).

Future Land Use Map Comments - 4/24/25 at Westgate Library and 4/30/25 at Mallets Creek Library

109	Fairs	"The One" is a new townhome development here and the local area should be "transition" to allow for future higher intensity development.
110	Oakdale	Why the sudden drop off from Hub to Residential? Allow for Transition around Washtenaw Avenue to allow for more housing/richer neighborhoods
111	Fair	This area is between highway and Briarwood and should be Hub as well.
112	Henry	I have 3 Concerns with zoning changes. 1) Right of Way widths along transition zones - public transportation zones. If too narrow will slow down emergency response times to neighborhoods and businesses in the area. 2) Some traditional single family neighborhoods far away from the U of M and downtown (those with close proximity to elementary schools) will change, potentially be less safe and have less opportunities for kids to walk, bike and play in a new redeveloped denser neighborhood. 3) Tall dwellings and buildings everywhere throughout the City restricts to drastically reduce sunlight to housing; what is the reasoning to go with four stories in neighborhoods verse two or three to be the limit?
113	Pine Valley	1/8 of a mile minimum to a bus stop - close grocery stores means 1 1/2 to 2 hours round trip; Streets already lots of cars - new multi unit apartments would be very bad.
114		Transition Districts are too close to Residential
115		Where is the data that supports these proposals?
116	Maplewood	Concordia University (Earhart/Geddes). This should change to Residential and Parks, Open Spaces. Many important natural features and woodlands remain on this site.
117	Dwight	I would like to see the area on Stone School between Eisenhower and Pebble Creek dr all remain residential - it could be an area to slow traffic and allow a safe crossing to get to the library. The brookside development is only 50 homes and historical a rare, lower income, blue collar homeowner group - the homes are smaller and sell for less and the E side of Stone School would more quickly be bought up and converted leaving the interior homes a small island. I think larger groupings of
118	Whittier	I wish there were more walkable places near me (retail, shops, etc.) We have great access to parks but I feel like I live in a food desert. I'm excited to see more development near me.
119	Wells	I like the idea of promoting multi-family housing. I don't want buildings that are out of scale with our existing houses. Love existing duplexes in our neighborhood. I want to keep setbacks and scale. I don't want a massive building packed with students with no character.
120	Baldwin	How do we make the areas where residents and students bump up against each other livable for both groups? Can there be some residential zoning that permits duplexes but not multi-units that are just built for maximum income?
121	Henry	My concern with allowing four story residential dwellings in neighborhoods and five to twenty story buildings along transition zones will greatly block and restrict sunlight into housing and along sidewalks - which will feel unsafe and depressing.
126	Coler	You should connect Maple to Eisenhower so that the transit corridor on Maple connects to the transit corridor on Eisenhower.
127	Coler	"Hub" Zoning should go down to Hoover between State and Main.,

Future Land Use Map Comments - 4/24/25 at Westgate Library and 4/30/25 at Mallets Creek Library

128	Coler	You should zone the E side of South Industrial Residential and keep the west side exclusively industrial. You should also build a new street to connect Astor to Esch following the County Drain.
129	Baylis	I am opposed to building taller than 3 stories in our area. While I appreciate those who want a more walkable community, I love my car and the time freedom it affords. I am less concerned about affordable housing and more concerned about taxes.
130	Marlborough	Look at all the unhappy people here - pessimistic that despite our protests/concerns we won't be listened to. All of this feels performative. An no parking - really? Even if you live on a bus lane, you need a car.
131		I am ok with an occasional 2 story bldg or 4 unit, 2-story multi-family units in Burns Park. However, I do not want developers descending on our neighborhood offering lots of money to get people to sell so they can tear down a perfectly good home and build a too big box for several condos/apartments. Even on Packard, where taller buildings would be appropriate, I would not want them more than 3 stories and would not want developers to pounce and make these expensive. What can't we manage
132	Marlborough	My neighborhood has many beautiful old trees. I'm concerned that new developers could remove these trees (many are on private property).
133		I do not think it is in this community's interest to give developers carte blanche to decide what gets built where. The market forces on housing will never get affordable housing without programs.
134	King George	Opposed to buildings with no parking - affordable housing will not be provided through greater supply necessarily.
135	Pine Valley	Flex Zone on South Industrial - Lifting of noise ordinance to residences that back up to South Industrial; Height limits on future buildings on Industrial
136	Amelia	I like the Transition District along Packard. Packard Row Apartments replace a long time blight for a strip mall and parking lot. I look forward to the area becoming more lively with people and services. Keep fighting the the good fight against sprawl to get
138	Marlborough	Our infrastructure will not support increased density. Fix the infrastructure. We need increased housing density but it must be done with keeping the sense of neighborhood intact. Build duplexes with a decent setback and parking.
139	Duncan	I don't see this helping my property value. We are being punished for being able to purchase property on a less busy road (aka "inner" neighborhood). This is just going to make developers happy. I also don't believe that most people are looking to purchase an apartment. They want a single-story house.
140	Maplewood	Would tighten transition area next to Jackson Road. This area really needs to be acquired as addition to Dolph Park to protect Sister Lake.
141	Brooklyn	Existing setbacks may need to be revised. Can't build 3-4 story without getting in neighbors yard. Also drainage may be issue. Residentis shouldn't have to hire lawyers.
142	Packard	C'mon gusy, save the woodland here. We can do better, revise from Transition to Residential.
143	E Stadium	The "Transition" area includes my property. That worries me. Some street improvement might be good, but I don't want my neighborhood canabalized.
145	Kensington	Preserve single house residences. Don not build 3 stories or more apartment dwellings. We have duplexes that are 2 story, that is fine! No mid level high rise in established neighborhoods! On-site parking is a must!

Future Land Use Map Comments - 4/24/25 at Westgate Library and 4/30/25 at Mallets Creek Library

146	Wells	I wish this student area (and others!) could be turned into housing for families.
147	Marlborough	Small businesses - having the flex area to be supportive enough to try to avoid displacement of local businesses like By the Pound, Roos Roast, PTO Thrift, etc. - they are the best (!) and are supporting services/walkability in the local community.
149	Harbal	Not happy to see the Transition District on Jones Drive, which is a very small street, already dealing with an overload of cars, delivery trucks, pedestrians (no sidewalks). This area can not support more development without reducing quality of life for the existing residents. Can't be safely done, unless all cars, etc. For new construction (residential and commercial) is routed directly out to Plymouth Road.
150	Forest Creek	All the "walkable" goals are not senior friendly. All the bicycle initiatives are causing me to get "run" off my sidewalk. Bikes must be coerced to use their lanes.
151	Forest Creek	R3-R4 High Density housing must be carefully located. Three stories is acceptable. Four stories is not neighborhood friendly. I do not want my neighborhood converted to an urban landscape.
153	Granger	Please think about areas like Burns Park where setbacks (on all sides) will be very important to maintain privacy and cohesiveness! The homes here are already very dense.
154	Granger	Totally support density in hubs and transition districts! I'm pretty ambivalent about changes to residential zoning, however
155	King George	I'm confused about the legends on the draft Future Land Use Map. Parts of King George is designated as transition. Does that mean all my neighbors can sell to light industrial users and I'd be surrounded by warehouses?
156	Easy	I would like to see 3-4 unit dwellings built on the existing footprint in our neighborhood. No more than 3 stories high. Street parking allowed.
190	Marlborough	In high rise areas, keep the street side attractive with planters, benches, shops. Think Paris streets!
191		Why can't the University build more housing for its students on north campus? They should not be able to keep admitting more and more students without decent affordable places to live, on north campus for instance. Then the student housing south of Hill could be sold to families (affordable housing).
192	Brooklyn	Look to what Nashville is doing - Strategic approach, don't overwhelm infrastructure. Keep neighborhood character - duplexes are fine; Have to commit to ownership percentage, not all rentals - oppressive to renters, no equity.
200	Baylis Dr.	Concerned about increasing the population density with apartment buildings of any size among residential neighborhoods. The road capacity can already be overcrowded, and there is no guarantee that folks will walk and or use a bus. Example: bringing home bags of groceries; if running a couple of areas on the opposite sides of town they may not take the extra time to walk, ride a bike, or wait for a bus.