



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Milton Dohoney Jr., City Administrator

CC: Derek Delacourt, Community Services Area Administrator
Brett Lenart, Planning Manager
Mariah Walton, Deputy City Administrator

SUBJECT: June 2, 2025 Council Agenda Response Memo

DATE: May 29, 2025

B-5 - An Ordinance to Amend Section 5.30 of Chapter 55 (Unified Development Code) of Title V of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor (PUD Modifications) CPC Recommendation: Approval (7 Yes, 0 No) (ORD-25-19)

Question: Can staff provide an example of "There have been several examples over recent years of PUD zoning districts being restricted from evolution/modification based on provisions of the City Code that require all owners with a property interest submit or approve any proposed modification." (Councilmember Akmon)

Response: Here are examples of this restriction occurring:

- Malletts Woods II – 3300 Cardinal – Required approval from 16 existing condominium owners to seek a modification to the PUD to construct 19 single family homes. This permission was granted, the modification was approved but never constructed.
- Plymouth Green Crossing – 3375 Plymouth – Petitioner explored modification to PUD regulations to allow a marijuana business to locate in a former bank building which was only permitted to be used for a financial institution. Other PUD property owners would not support the application, so it could not move forward.
- Altarum PUD – 3525 Green Road – City staff had contact with multiple developers regarding development of apartments at vacant site, which would require PUD modification. These parties were not able to secure approval from other PUD site owners.

- Ashley Mews – 414 S. Main – Sought to modify PUD regulations to allow Short Term Rentals in former DTE building. Other property owners would not support application and/or seeking permission was seen as a barrier from moving forward.
- State/Huron – 100 N. State – Sought to modify PUD regulations to allow residential uses in houses, could not gain permission from other property owners. The City has received notice of possible legal action regarding this petition (which could be resolved from the proposed ordinance).