

**Subject:**

Public Comment/CLUP Draft 4

**From:** Lisa Wu Fate

**Sent:** Tuesday, February 10, 2026 3:10 PM

**To:** Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>

**Subject:** Public Comment/CLUP Draft 4

**Residential**

**Intent:**  
A primarily residential category that expands the housing types (not exclusively single family detached) to foster a more dynamic neighborhood atmosphere with limited commercial uses, support diverse housing needs, and enable aging in place within established communities.

**Rationale:**  
Community engagement revealed support for a broader range of housing types within traditionally single-family neighborhoods, provided new development aligns with the existing scale. Some have expressed concerns about potential impacts on existing neighborhoods, but this district is designed to allow for incremental increases in density. The district promotes walkability and a range of price points in housing options. Growing the housing supply throughout residential areas contributes to greater affordability and equity. The addition of small-scale commercial uses further supports walkable neighborhoods by bringing everyday amenities and services closer to home, helping to create a more dynamic and sustainable future. Based on this input, the plan identifies broad permissions for three stories and up to three units (or larger housing typologies where they fit into the neighborhood context) as appropriate for these areas.

Translating the Residential Category into zoning regulations will require thoughtful implementation. Further analysis will be necessary to determine additional strategies for regulating building form and scale, which will be addressed during the implementation process.

**Primary Uses/Buildings:**

- Single family, Duplexes, and Triplexes are permitted by right, with additional building types allowed where consistent with neighborhood form and scale.
- Cottage courts
- Stacked flats?
- Townhouses - where there is adequate depth and access
- Neighborhood commercial "corner store"

**Secondary Uses/Buildings:**

- Small multi-family building

**Form & Site Considerations:**

- Buildings up to 3 stories
- Standards should encourage the development of smaller, more flexible homes, and may address maximum building size, setbacks, building coverage, parcel assemblages, lot size, number of dwellings, unit counts, and/or bedroom counts—as appropriate—to support flexibility, scale, and compatibility within residential areas.

Dear City Council-

I recognize that this document is not itself a law, and that its adoption does not alter existing zoning ordinances or other binding regulations. By design, it is an aspirational and guiding framework rather than a regulatory instrument.

That said, guiding documents matter precisely because they inform future regulatory action, discretionary approvals, and staff interpretation. For that reason, the language used here is not merely academic. Phrases such as “Standards should encourage...” are inherently ambiguous and read as policy aspirations rather than clear expectations, even within a non-binding framework.

If this document is intended to guide future rulemaking, zoning amendments, or development review, it should articulate clear principles and measurable parameters—such as expectations around maximum building size, setbacks, and lot size—so that future regulatory actions are grounded in defined community values rather than open-ended discretion.

Absent clearer direction, aspirational language provides little assurance that A2 residential neighborhoods will be protected from development that encroaches on neighboring properties, obstructs access to light (including for solar installations the City has stated it seeks to encourage), or erodes established neighborhood character. It also offers insufficient guidance for managing impacts to existing infrastructure, including parking, water, and sewer capacity.

While I appreciate the City's continued solicitation of public input, I see limited evidence that community feedback has been meaningfully translated into guiding principles that would constrain or shape future regulatory decisions. Without clearer direction, the framework risks functioning less as an expression of community priorities and more as a flexible justification for outcomes that disproportionately benefit commercial development interests.

I urge the City to strengthen this document by providing clearer, more specific guidance that can meaningfully inform future regulatory action. I remain hopeful that the final framework will better reflect community input and the City's stated policy goals, and that it will serve as a credible foundation for decisions that balance development, neighborhood stability, infrastructure capacity, and affordable housing.

Sincerely,

Lisa Wu Fate, Esq.  
*email:* [lisawu@umich.edu](mailto:lisawu@umich.edu)