

Subject: Please update table in PROS Plan 2023-2027

From: Paul Schultz
Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2025 10:29 AM
To: Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>
Cc: City Council <CityCouncil@a2gov.org>; Lenart, Brett <BLenart@a2gov.org>; Bennett, Michelle <MBennett@a2gov.org>; Fercho, Adam <AFercho@a2gov.org>; Manor, Courtney <CManor@a2gov.org>
Subject: Re: Please update table in PROS Plan 2023-2027

Dear Planning Commission,

a) while I disagree with the [false controversy](#) that the A2PTP folks are trying to gin up regarding the municipal golf courses, I do agree with them that the next version of the CLUP should have a different figure and citation at bullet point 1 on Page 56.

b) In looking at the [Park Planning](#) webpage, I see that a web-formatting error I noted to you 3.5 months ago has still not been fixed.

[2023-27 PROS Plan approved plan, 15 MB](#) (PDF)

[2023-27 PROS Plan approved plan, 40MB](#) (PDF)

The first hyperlink still does not link to a 15 MB document; the second hyperlink still does not link to a 40MB document.

c) On Tuesday, at the League of Women Voters forum regarding the Library Lot ballot measures, Ralph McKee and/or Rita Mitchell cited the 2023-27 PROS Plan in their slide deck to make the same species of incorrect claim or implication about Core Planning Area recreational amenities that I tried to call to your attention in March (vis. "[that every resident of any tower built on the Library Lot would be surrounded by concrete and would be more than six(?) blocks from any recreational green space].").

Even if the PROS Plan itself cannot be updated until 2026, I again encourage you to be working on this matter now and thinking through how the significant university green space is characterized as to the supermajority of Core Planning Area residents who are university affiliates.

Thanks,
~Paul

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Paul Schultz
Date: Tue, Mar 4, 2025 at 10:15 AM
Subject: Please update table in PROS Plan 2023-2027
To: <planning@a2gov.org>
Cc: <citycouncil@a2gov.org>

Dear City Council and Planning Commission,

If recent drafts of the Comprehensive Plan are any indication, you are doing some pretty good work for Ann Arbor, even if some staff members are not ready to go far enough in expanding the "downtown area" enough south of Hill Street and east of Washtenaw to permit high-rise construction.

But what I'm mainly writing to you about today is the **STATISTICS FROM 2020 CENSUS** table on page {11} of the most recent Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan (page 20 of the 168 page pdf that is available - fyi: [both available](#) links on the [Park Planning](#) page download a 6 meg document; neither downloads a 15 meg nor a 40 meg document).

In discussions of downtown and residents and parks, there is at least one member of our community who opposes most new housing construction who has [repeatedly flogged](#) the [4.11 acres of parkland per 1,000 Central Planning Residents] data point from the bottom left corner of this table.

Please expand the Census reported in this table to include some good measure of University of Michigan property that is available for at least student downtown residents to make use of.

Let us create and edit public resources so that they are less apt to be used for misinformation. The 4.11 acre ratio reported for the Central Planning Area is so incomplete as to be unhelpful in summarizing or thinking about our city.

73% of the residents in the Central Planning Area are acknowledged to be students, but the table treats University Quads, etc. as non-existent. Yes, it is true that University space is literally not City parkland. But, at the same time, some University space does bear some analogy to parkland, at least to the 73% of the residents living in that Planning Area who are students. It would not be wise to budget for future parkland by treating Quads as non-existent.

e.g., the Park Inventory (starting on page {45}) characterizes the Arboretum Nature Area as 28.40 acres. But when I hop over to Google Maps and measure a common-sense outline of the Arb and prairie, I find 124 acres - all of which in some service to students recreating in the Central Planning Area. (While I wouldn't argue a 1:1 analogy with parkland, the adjacent 42 acres of Forest Hills Cemetery also offer some additional getting-out-to-nature opportunities for residents of, e.g., the Hill Dorms.)

Even where it acknowledges the Diag on page {73}, the PROS report misses the acreage by half. The central (Block M) square in front of Hatcher Graduate Library may be "approximately 9 acres," but the Diag runs from State&NorthU to EastU&SouthU. And there is at least another 9 acres in green space and walking plazas on the Central Campus Mega Block, to say nothing of the 2 acres in the Law Quad, the 1.5 acres at Martha Cook, the 3 acres of Ingalls Mall, etc.

Excluding the 27 acres at Mitchell Field from a consideration of the recreational opportunities for Central Campus students ... is ... a decision.

As we think about the amount of housing to allow to perhaps be built near central campus we will be assisted if we correctly recognize the total amount of recreational space that will be available for most of the people that will live there.

thanks,
~Paul