

| Number | Street | Map Notes from All Three Open House Sessions |
|--------|---------------|---|
| 1 | N State St. | 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 Street | Howley Court, Longshore, Swift, West Side of Wright Street should NOT be Transition District, but should be Residential District |
| 4 | South 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 not 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 Ave | Packard Ro is a mess now. Too congested. Please do NOT add high raises -- it's becoming unbearable. Killing local neighborhood. |
| 12 | Traver Street | Traver Street across from Leslie Science & Nature Center up to the Golf Course should be Low Rise Residential NOT Transition. |
| 13 | Olivia Ave | Burns Park should remain single (detached) and duplex housing only. No commercial businesses. |
| 14 | Traver Rd | 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 people! |
| 17 | Traver Street | 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 Bv. | It's clear that a lot of thought has gone into planning Ann Arbor's future. Some density may be desirable but I believe you will 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 | Even tho the planning commission has been working on the CL Draft for 2 years (read this in the 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. I realize change is inevitable but doing it in such big way jamming it thro + down our throats is unacceptable, disrespectful 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. |
| 21 | Fairview | Intersection of Stadium & Maple this is very pedestrian bicycle unfriendly undermines the landuse proposal to make this area a hub. |
| 22 | Woodlawn | NO three or four story "houses" in Burns Park. TOO dense now - proximity to campus would make it a haven for students who are NOT invested in our neighborhoods Too dense right now - our street is too narrow for 2-way traffic. NO to 3-4 story residential |
| 25 | East Stadium Blvd | Key words: plan for people: family formation etc. state constitutionally independent (UM) resource conservation through preservation neighborhoods for all ages community sustaining |
| 26 | | not 147-page plan... should less than be 47 pages, less cartoons; more transparent data (and less) Too much jargon; very wordy |

| | | |
|----|-----------------|---|
| 27 | West Side | 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. |
| 28 | Olivia | Thank you for moving the mixed use line to the West Side of Au Forest. This allows all of (???) to be in the lower yard. |
| 29 | White St. | Please stop Heidis monopoly \$\$\$ a la Elon |
| 30 | | Stop repeating the unfounded # for # of commuters! 80,000 ? Not realistic - what is the sources? |
| 32 | Brooks Corridor | 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 not to have apartments next door! |
| 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 dont live |
| 36 | Archwood Dr. | 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 least boundary streets for various zones! |
| 38 | Felch St. | Miller Road (Transition corridor) runs behind my |
| 39 | Felch St. | 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 Dr. | 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, or outside of it. |
| 42 | Barber Ave. | 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 neighborhors 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 up 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 Dr | 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 | Lowelk | What does this plan do to (???) Ann Arborites who want to preserve the look/feel + density of their current neighborhoods? |
| 48 | Dartmoor Rd | I want to be able to find housing/transit that fits me & my family through all stages of life -> I don't want to give up my neighborhood if I don't want the house more housing more neighbors more business more Ann Arbor |
| 49 | Manor Dr | 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, but it seems that many of these planned mixed use areas sit empty? |
| 50 | S. Revena Blvd | Dislikes - everything 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 Pkwy | 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 Rd. | 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 gaps? I (???) if (???) plan is for a developer to densify - totally stalled build all 3 + stop worrying about customization. |
| 55 | Granger Ave. | 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 + nature. |
| 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 with 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? |
| 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 about my property value? What about runoff into Mallett's Creek? What about the traffic congestion? This is a poorly thought out plan. I will spread the word. |
| 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 would 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 don't understand. |

| | | |
|----|-------------------|--|
| 65 | Pine Valley Ct. | 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 least my house is). I don't want multiplexes, duplexes in the middle of neighborhood, but along edges of Washtenaw, Packard I could live with. |
| 67 | Indianaola | I don't like the destruction of my neighborhood that will come with getting rid of single family housing. It will not produce more affordable housing. It will enable more million-dollar condos. And it will damage the value of my property if a 3-story apartment blg. is put next door. |
| 68 | Glendaloch Circle | 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 Cir | 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 Street | The south side of Woodlawn is proposed as low rise reisidential; 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 was said |
| 72 | Traver Street | Dewey can be like the South Main Street "Canyon" Not desifable |

| | | |
|----|---------------|---|
| 74 | Miner St | 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 St | 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 success. |
| 79 | | what success/effectiveness have previous plans had... does the plan help to respond to adverse conditions? [does the \$\$ (???) gathers 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 Dr. | 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 property value even more. |
| 83 | Kimberly | 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 East? 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 overflow. |

| | | |
|-----|-------------|---|
| 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. Its 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 resdential 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'a 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 desireable 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. The 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 Ct | 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 Ct | 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). |
| 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 Ct | 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 east side of Stone School would more quickly be bought up and converted leaving the interior homes a small island. I think larger groupings of residential and transition would be better. Thanks. |
| 118 | Whittier Ct | I wish ther 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-famly 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 ther 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., |
| 128 | Coler | You should zone the East 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 buildiing 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? Evenn if you live on a bus lane, you need a car. |

| | | |
|-----|----------------|---|
| 131 | Burns Park | 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 what is developed? |
| 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 Ct | 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 Pl | 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 more density. |
| 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 St | 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! |

| | | |
|-----|-------------------|--|
| 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 Dr | 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 Ct. | 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 Ct. | 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 Blvd | I'm confused about the legends on the draft Future Land Use Map. Parts of King George Blvd 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 St. | 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. |
| 170 | Upland Dr | I am concerned about infrastructure. Multiple resident buildings will severely strain water, sewer, etc. This is an old neighborhood with ancient infrastructure. Water mitigation is already an issue. |
| 171 | Burlington St | Thehevston neighborhood would be a dream for construction companies and a nightmare for us. House prices are below Logan and King neighborhoods and therefore sought after by speculators. |
| 172 | Rosewood | 2003 Greenbelt passed with a 30 year 0.5 mil tax aimed at preserving open space & farmland IN and around Ann Arbor. Omitting the word "IN" reeks of politics |
| 173 | Burlington Street | Hurston has many areas prone to flooding. Loosing parts of the school - area will make matters worse already. Paving and building over more soil will make waters worse. |

| | | |
|-----|-------------------|--|
| 175 | Burlington Street | I question the basis of the plan. UM will likely cut jobs - as will others - in the next years, so growth will be much less than anticipated. Infrastructure will not support growth. |
| 176 | Burlington St | If you look at other cities, you see that the plan crushes the soul of a place. See how Berkeley, CA, changed, for example. I can't imagine most Ann Arborites want to live in a place like this. |
| 177 | Skydale Dr | I do not support your plans for residential areas. This is a neighborhood of 1 and 2 story houses. Even a 3 story structure on a small city lot, built 15' away from a 1 story structure is too much. No single property owner should be able to change the zoning for a lot in an established neighborhood. |
| 179 | Austin Ave | Pause this plan & get Comprehensive Feedback from the people that live here. I appreciate some of the goals - but mostly feel very concerned with methodology, claims, omissions & bias. Developers' Plan - not good. |
| 180 | Traver Blvd | Michigan Association of Railroad Passengers Fuller Road site across from Fuller Pool should be reserved for a future railroad (intermodal) station. It is the only viable alternative to the prenasnt site on Deput St. The Depot St site is now being, severely limited because of new development, especially DTE project. |
| 181 | Needham Rd. | Our Ward 3 neighborhood has at least 1,400 rental units in apartments on the perimeter - Stadium, Medfurd, Packard, Platt so we do not see a need for duplexes or quadplexes amidst our single family homes, changing the character of the neighborhood. It's important to us that set-backs & greenspace on lots remains as it is. We are 34 year residents in our home. |
| 182 | Crestland Ward | This applies to all current RI zones I am concerned about parking, congestion, solar grabbing or block (I made that phrase up), noise & light pollution, new builds fitting into existing neighborhoods + the tree canopy for shade + animals Way too much power in the hands of developers - many of whom may not even live anywhere near Ann Arbor or even in Michigan |
| 183 | Miller Ave | VERY concerned to have a longterm residential street declassified. Please leave Miller residential, AT LEAST portion west of seventh outside central city area. 7 story buildings in the miller area is ridiculous. |
| 184 | Miller Avenue | I am so concerned about our street becoming apartment buildings. We have some ADUs and that's fine. What good is it going to do to ruin residential areas? There is a 150 yo house next to us and a 120 yo house across the street. No one has talked to anyone we know re: this plan. We already are going to have to deal with a bike lane that no one asked residents about. |

| | | |
|-----|-----------------|--|
| 185 | Lexington | I like the use of TCI principle in those areas I on't support drastic change to RI - e.g. 4 units/plot |
| 186 | Burlington Ct | concerned about how changes would be carried out concern for old growth trees (planting 20 new ones doesn't cut it) Like idea of creating hubs & more varied housing |
| 188 | Fox Hunt Dr | Miller - Do not classify as transition Remove 2-way cycle track, replace w/ protected bike lanes & make Arbor View a Cycle Blvd Implement Vision Zero for real, esp. engineering & evaluation Monitor road construction sites Install sidewalks & new condos at East excl of Sunset Thank you |
| 193 | Broadway St | Please show Brewery development and Brookside apartments on future use maps |
| 194 | Paul St. | "The majority of folks that I have spoken to want an Ann Arbor that balances density and character, and that embraces development but insists that its impact not damage existing neighborhoods" (quote from Chris Taylor) over 7 stories and commercial on Paul Street! Please, this quote applies to other neighborhoods than Burns Park, Chris! |
| 195 | Barton Dr. | Keep a flex district but not too large. Allow home businesses. Mixed use buildings are good but rent must be reasonable for businesses and startups. |
| 196 | Nature Cove Ct. | ALL these plans will be unworkable without (???) to infrastructure - roads, traffic etc. All the high rises being built accep... (??? - the rest of this sentence is illegible) The future draft areas densifying the (???) of our wonderful college town tha was + turning us into Detroit Density not desirable |
| 198 | Creal Crescent | I would like more clarification on the building heights in transition cooridors. Do more narrow roads factor in? We are considering solar panels & our rea neighbor is on Miller. The sun we receive will be different if there are 7 story buildings on both sides of Miller. Is there any clarity on set back requirements? For example, my neighbor on Miller has a lot around 120 feet deep. Where could a 7 story building fit on that, and how close will it be to my property & home? |
| 199 | Crest Ave | Increased density in hub and transition districts is fine (and should be sufficient for the city's needs). But do not change the character of existing neighborhoods. |
| 203 | Gladstone | 100% opposed to zoning that allows multifamily development in area/neighborhoods of single family homes. (unless they are on major commuter/transportatino corridors backing up to those neighborhoods, whose access & parking is not through the neighborhoods). |

| | | |
|-----|----------------|--|
| 205 | Blvelt Rd | Very in favor of building more housing. Mixed use zoning sounds like a good idea. However, I would like to see more concrete rules around preserving trees & green spaces. Thank you. |
| 209 | Upland Dr | I find it ironic the arbitrary condemnation of our street without any preknowledge or chance to comment beforehand. Much the way this whole development plan has been handled until recently. |
| 210 | Morton Ave | Need more ADA parking in downtown (City Hall, Main St. Farmers Market areas), State St. area - between liberty and S University), and by district libraries, esp. Mallet Creek |
| 211 | Broadway | Requiring 25' Setback in the new zoning bylaw will go a long way to maintaining a green and attractive Ann Arbor streetscape. Worth considering. |
| 212 | Applewood Ct | I like more housing/mixed use everywhere! Especially along River! |
| 213 | Prairie St. | I love living next to two elementary schools, a middle school, a library branch, grocery stores, and convenient bus stops. More people should be able to do this! It wouldn't bother me to live next to apartment buildings. Thanks for your work! |
| 214 | Morton Ave | Keep multiplex housing in areas like Burn Park to no more than 3 stories. Consider parking, pickup or trash/recycling/compost, in terms of housing density. |
| 215 | Joyce | put ceiling on rents for 3 story townhomes prevents developers from tearing down comun homes especially single family + student houses |
| 216 | Joyce | Provide off street parking for new townhomes Ask developers for at least 259 affordable in all new units. Make all housing ADA compliant |
| 217 | Ember Way | I hate the high rising-unaffordable apartments For transient wealthy pple, airbubs etc - ruined my corner of A2 - My walkability, local services etc. Please pull the plan + do a robust community engagement like Boulder + Madison. |
| 219 | Martin Place | This is the home of my former across-the-street neighbors. They have lived there for decades w/ their adult disabled son. Why would you enable a 7-story bldg w/ businesses next door to them? This is a student area and one will most certainly be built. It would drive them out. Please consider current neighbors when drawing these lines. They are not random. This could destroy lives. |
| 220 | Brentwood | Would love to have S Industrial and Briarwood have walkable/bikeable businesses near our home! |
| 221 | Eberwhite Blvd | Really excited about making the Stadium/Maple/Jackson area becoming a hub. We do much of our shopping there, mostly by bike, but it's an unpleasant & dangerous place to bike. I'd love to see more density, more housing, and more walkability in that area! |

| | | |
|-----|---------------------|---|
| 222 | Parkwood Ave | <p>I think neighborhoods should have control over what gets built. The idea that a contractor's plans would be approved if or because they are compliant is insufficient. An unhappy neighborhood is an unhappy city.</p> <p>I also think broad city-wide zoning changes can allow for unforeseen surprises. Furthermore, lower-mid range neighborhoods (the whitezones) will be impacted and the (???) the neighborhoods, situated on large lots, won't be (also white zones). When a person buys a family home, s/he wants neighborhood continuity over time. Very different from a student's, postdoc's needs and desires.</p> |
| 223 | Kensington Dr. | <p>I need a clear map showing my address will not be a Industrial space as I am on dead @ Kensington and butt up against Hutzel Heating - with a fence but what will happen to my protection to keep my fence to separate my residential house from Flex/Industrial. What is difference between light manufacturing and flex. What will happen to my back yard as it butts up to Jewett Road that is/might be an "transitional" street. Not happy.</p> |
| 224 | Russett (Eberwhite) | Would love to see more housing and businesses in transitional/hub along the W Stadium Corridor |
| 225 | Kensington Dr. | What will the zoning/transitional Jewett Road |
| 226 | N Spurway Dr | I do not like this turning into a hub district in our residential area. We moved to A2 in 2021 and if this plan is approved, we are moving OUT! |
| 227 | Kensington Dr. | <p>my property backs up to the homes on Jewett Road</p> <p>What will be different for my Kensington Dr. Lot line to Jewett Rd Lot that backs up to my property.</p> |
| 228 | Ashley Mews Dr | Generally excited about this plan. However, the flex districts feel like they should be transition. There's already an exciting mix of residential and commercial on industrial rd. Being able to walk around Roos sound exciting. Transition zone better reflects the opportunity here. |
| 229 | Brandywine | This ruins single family R4 neighborhoods. It is unfair for 2 large building to be next to a single family home, and to crowd parking and streets |
| 230 | North Spurway Drive | City needs to respect parks, student housing, drivability. I do not want crushing increase population to wreck ambiance of Ann Arbor |
| 231 | Brandywine A | the increased density would require most utilities to be redone. The footing drain disconnect program in ~2012 gave diverted rain from the sanitary sewer. This plan would again overflow sewers and the treatment plant. Current residents would need to pay for improvements, not just new construction |
| 232 | White St | Please extend the transition district to include the homes on White St. |
| 233 | | I want to transform Plymouth so it is safe and enjoyable place to be and travel. I support density and mixed-use (4 stories doesn't bother me). I think this would be a good rea for more transit and shops/resident-services. |
| 234 | | This area around the hospitals/campus has a lot of old, rundown homes carved up by landlords. I would rather have dense, designed apartments than what is usually there now. Students and the city deserve better. Plus it is a good location. |

| | | |
|-----|-----------------|---|
| 235 | Woodbury Dr. | Please lower house prices. More high-rises! (please) Please create surplus housing |
| 236 | Lake Park Lane | Consider limits to building footprint size in residential. If several lots are purchased, require they be developed individually or divided based on average lot size of them. Duplex/Wuad but not large footprints. |
| 237 | Taylor Street | This should change from transition district to residential from the main tracks North West. People from all over Ann Arbor and Barreno West Seven / Golf Course - the country feel or the road (???) is dependent on the two (???) or the (???) low res residence w/ lots of greespace + trees. I am also concerned that the increased density will (???) in road traffic (nor eversince bikes in work) and how danger. I run and bike (along (???) on trail road daily. We can densify and keep part of Ann Arbor feeling like a small city. |
| 238 | Huntington | 1) Private one - lane road. How does that work with denser community? 2) Permeable surface - already lots of runn off into rock creek. |
| 239 | Martin Place | The way the plan is written now does not take into consideration the impact on campus-adjacent residential housing. What is the benefit of more (and expensive) student housing in an elementary school neighborhood? Nothing! This plan claims it will create affordable housing - How?? Show us data. |
| 241 | Frederick | I would like to see public river access and public gathering spaces - maybe somewhere for food trucks? |
| 242 | Taylor Street | This should change from transitional plot to residential. The (???) roads / under (???) can't handle the additional traffic. This neighborhood serves as a buffer for the river with its higher density (???) and (???). I would like to see efforts to densify (???) along (??? - rest of the paragraph is illegible). I am concerned that the one residential zones (??) will densify the neighborhood differentiated that makes Ann Arbor desirable. |
| 243 | Frederick Drive | Transit that connects to other regional systems - like to Detroit or Airport |
| 244 | Powell | I own a home on Powell, all single family homes with many many trees. Duplexes, small apartment buildings, and lot build-outs would destroy my nice neighborhood. |
| 245 | Brookside | This awful plan could ruin my nice neighborhood! Do not all apartments or duplexes to replace existing single-family homes. It also crowds a quiet neighborhood with more traffic and noise. |
| 246 | White St. | Ann Arbor needs to try something. Housing will not become cheaper, this plan at least attempts to do something, even if its bad at the end of the day. |
| 247 | Lindsay Ln | In gneeral, I like the hub district on Washtenaw, but it should extend further west (until the Stadium intersection). |

| | | |
|-----|------------------|--|
| 248 | Prairie Street | I like the increased density along Plymouth. I would like to make sure Hub continued to allow housing + neighborhood commercial. I support allowing more gentle density in our neighborhood - it would allow more families to access a walkable neighborhood close to great schools, jobs + parks without having to pay \$500k+. I think allowing more density would help encourage investments in run down houses. Would like to see city work to maintain green spaces + street trees despite more development. |
| 249 | Broadway | Some of your "transition zones" are totally inappropriate. Like Traver Rd? Heaven help us! Don't ruin it. |
| 250 | Briarcliff St AA | We are very excited about the hub district around plymouth/Nixon/Huron Parkway + would love more walkable shopping + dining options! (Bring on the ice cream store!) Would LOVE more safe bike lanes + a safe way to connect to downtown from here! Thank you!!! |
| 257 | Westaire Ct | high rises should not take over the view of the city. When entering town on lexpress way do not want to see only high rises Should not be UofM property |
| 252 | Carlton Dr | Can we get bike lanes/car diet on Washtenaw all the way to Ypsi please? |
| 253 | Bending Rd. | Please stop this plan. This plan puports to |
| 254 | | The zoning of Stadium/Maple for highest density high-rise buildings will destroy the section of small retail that draws so many residents to do business. That is what remains of Ann Arbor useful retail - don't drive us to big box stores. |
| 255 | Bending Rd. | Housing is more nuanced than simple supply & demand. The way the city has changed recently has been driven by developers properties in neighborhoods with character are being torn down & replaced by luxury duplexes - which does not trickle down, it increases land value, which only accelerates gentrification & makes housing less affordable & in the process changes neighborhood demographics: not (???), not diverse. My other concern is how much green space has been destroyed in the name of this development. It feels like an erosion of public goods - the multiple multi-million dollar condos on top of Argo & the recent clearing of trees along (???)&Core (???) is a horrendous loss that we will never get back. This comprehensive plan will only give more preference to the development & will only accelerate the erosion of this city, it's neighborhood & our green space - stop the plan. More control. Not less |
| 257 | Granger Ave. | I do not want Burns Park, from Hill (including Forest Ct., Forest) to densify any further - west to State, south to Packard, east to Washtenaw. Also, Pattengill and Iriquois should remain as-is, too. Please. This would be so awful. |