

MEMORANDUM

To:	Ann Arbor City Planning Commission Brett Lenart, Ann Arbor City Planning Manager
From:	Commissioner Daniel Adams
Re:	Execution Proposal – July 21, 2025 Council Resolution Regarding Comprehensive Land Use Plan
Date:	July 24, 2025

I. Introduction

On July 21, 2025, the Ann Arbor City Council (“**Council**”) passed resolution 25-1371 (“**Resolution**”), which requested a series of edits to the draft Comprehensive Land Use Plan (“**CLUP**”).

To assist the City Planning Commission and Planning staff with the efficient consideration of the Resolution, this memorandum contains a series of proposed edits to the CLUP that are intended to memorialize each of the Council’s ten individual recommendations.

II. Proposed Edits

A. Council Request 1

- i. Requested Change: “Clarification that the Plan and the included Future Land Use Map articulate visions for land use categories that will be later implemented via multiple zoning districts that harmonize housing opportunity with neighborhood context.”
- ii. Proposed Edits: On page 108, add the following paragraph after the paragraph that ends with “. . . adaptable for future growth.”: “Importantly, the Future Land Use Map is not a zoning map. It presents a citywide vision that will be implemented through multiple zoning districts. These zoning districts will reflect the values of housing access and equity, using tools such as building form, walkability, and public realm design to guide outcomes that are inclusive and responsive to community needs.”

B. Council Request 2

- i. Requested Change: “Recommendation of a range of infill options in the Residential Category (Draft v. 2), where duplexes and triplexes are provided widespread opportunity and ease of development, and where larger building typologies are authorized only where they would fit into existing neighborhood contexts.”

ii. Proposed Edits:

- Page 114: Under “Preferred Building Form” column in the “Residential District” row, add the following bullet: “Duplexes and triplexes permitted by right, with additional building types allowed where consistent with neighborhood form and scale.”
- Page 117: Under “Scale and intensity of use:,” add: “Duplexes and triplexes permitted by right; additional building types allowed where consistent with neighborhood form and scale.”
- Page 118: Revise the following paragraph as follows (edits in ***bold/italics***): “Based on this input, the plan ***recommends*** three stories as an appropriate maximum height for these areas. ***Duplexes and triplexes permitted by right throughout the Residential District, with additional building types allowed where consistent with neighborhood form and scale.***”
- Page 118: Add under “Form and Site Considerations”: “Duplexes and triplexes are permitted by right, with additional building types allowed where consistent with neighborhood form and scale.”

C. Council Request 3

- i. Requested Change: “Recommendation that zoning implementations of the residential category (Draft v. 2) utilize tools that ensure it is feasible for new housing to be steadily developed, while fitting harmoniously into neighborhood context, which may include a subset of regulations that: - Limit parcel assemblages (lot combinations) or create maximum lot size requirements. - Maintain some setback requirements and consider increased setback requirements for larger building typologies. - Regulate structures by building height. - Encourage smaller, more flexible homes. - Specify maximum amounts of lot coverage. - Specify maximum structure size through floor area and/or floor area ratio that restricts structure size based on lot size. - Limit the total number of units per building and/or number of bedrooms per unit.”
- ii. Proposed Edits: Page 118: Add to the list of “Form & Site Considerations” the following third bullet: “Standards should encourage the development of smaller, more flexible homes, and may address building size, setbacks, building coverage, parcel assemblages, lot size, number of dwellings, unit counts, and/or bedroom counts—as appropriate—to support livability, scale, and compatibility within residential areas.”

D. Council Request 4

- i. Requested Change: “A recognition that the enrollment growth of the

University of Michigan has created housing market pressure. The Plan should acknowledge this market pressure and clearly support more University of Michigan-related housing in Hub and Transition neighborhoods.”

ii. Proposed Edits:

- Page 23: Revise the following paragraph as follows (edits in bold/italics): “***The enrollment growth of the University of Michigan has created housing market pressure.*** Since 2015, the University of Michigan has added 9,208 students, averaging an additional 1,000 students per year. A record number of applications were received for fall 2025. While the university is building a new residence hall on the former Elbel Field site, most students still must find housing off-campus.”
- Pages 120 and 122: Add “University of Michigan-related housing” to the list of “Primary Uses/Buildings” in the summaries of Hub and Transition.

E. Council Request 5

- i. Requested Change: “Recommendation to explore an expedited permitting process for duplexes and triplexes in the Residential Category (Draft v. 2) to achieve gradual infill for a diverse range of residents, including workers and families.”
- ii. Proposed Edits: Add paragraph to page 106: “**Facilitating Infill through Process Improvements.** To support gradual and affordable infill, especially in Residential areas, future zoning implementation should explore expedited permitting pathways for small-scale multifamily housing—especially duplexes and triplexes. Removing unnecessary barriers to these housing types can help ensure that new homes are added steadily, without delay or disproportionate administrative burden. Additionally, as part of aligning zoning with land use categories, existing height exceptions in the Unified Development Code (UDC) should be reviewed and reconsidered for removal in the Residential district, where 3-story form is intended to be the general maximum. The applicability of height bonuses—such as those tied to sustainability incentives—should be carefully evaluated during the zoning phase, and may be more appropriately confined to designated Hub and Transition areas.”

F. Council Request 6

- i. Requested Change: “A recommendation that height exceptions currently provided in the Uniform Development Code be removed from the Residential Category (Draft v. 2).”

- ii. Proposed Edits: See proposed edits under Council Request 5.

G. Council Request 7

- i. Requested Change: “Data to disclose the change in Ann Arbor’s median home price vs inflation and Ann Arbor’s median rent vs inflation during whatever time frame Staff concludes to be relevant.”
- ii. Proposed Edits: Staff to decide how best to execute this Council recommendation.

H. Council Request 8

- i. Requested Change: “Recommendation to review rates of development and housing affordability measures within five years of approval of the Comprehensive Plan and to make modifications to plan as appropriate.”
- ii. Proposed Edits: Staff to decide how best to execute this Council recommendation.

I. Council Request 9

- i. Requested Change: “Acknowledge that short term rental uses can reduce permanent resident housing opportunity and provide material limitations on short term rental uses in the Transition category.”
- ii. Proposed Edits:
 - Page 15: Add the following sentence to the end of the paragraph that currently concludes “. . . (see charts on p 16.)”: “Short term rental uses have also reduced permanent resident housing opportunities in certain neighborhoods.”
 - Page 120: Add under “Primary Uses/Buildings”: “Restrictions on short term rental uses in Transition should be explored during zoning revision.”

J. Council Request 10

- i. Requested Change: “An identification of existing laws, rules, and regulations that will prevent Transition category light industrial uses from constituting a nuisance with respect to adjacent housing (whether such housing is in the Transition or Residential category).”
- ii. Proposed Edits:
 - Page 120: Revise “Industrial” to “Light Industrial.”

- Page 120: Add under “Form and Site Considerations”: “UDC nuisance, permitted uses, and performance standards should be reviewed and revised as appropriate to permit the appropriate and safe integration of hybrid businesses and light industrial into Transition districts.”