

Subject:

Comprehensive Land Use Plan Comments

From: David Gregorka**Sent:** Tuesday, October 7, 2025 10:10 AM**To:** Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>**Cc:** a2n2contact; Briggs, Erica <EBriggs@a2gov.org>; Cornell, Jenn <JCornell@a2gov.org>**Subject:** Comprehensive Land Use Plan Comments

To Planning Commission---

The plan STILL is not reflecting important comments. Some key examples follow. There are more, but these are key in my opinion. This plan needs to be changed to reflect all the concerns and viewpoints!

Overall, this plan needs to adopt an approach of **Do No Harm to Existing Residents**. Weave this into the plan and many objections will be met. For example, if the density of single family zoned areas is increased by allowing duplexes, do so within the existing R-1 setback and height restrictions. All R-1 building requirements (height, setback, lot size, etc.) should apply to duplexes in current R-1 areas and current R-1 areas should be limited to single family and duplex structures. This is a reasonable approach that has little adverse impact on adjacent properties. The key word throughout is REASONABLE.

Page 51, Goal 1. Add to the end of the goal, "...while not adversely impacting current residents."

Page 51, Goal 2. Add to the end of the goal, "...while not adversely impacting current residents."

Page 51, Housing, Bullet 2. "There is mixed support..." It's misleading to imply strong support and to ignore all the objections. Also, add to the end of the first sentence, "...and doing so by increasing current zoning limits (scaling), has been strongly objected to."

Page 51, Housing, Bullet 3. Delete, "are not a big change" and replace it with, "do not". Again, the way this is written it implies an overwhelming number of people are in agreement. This is NOT the case. There are opposing views on how this plan is implemented. Reflect them!

Page 51, Neighborhoods, Bullet 4. Add the following to the end of the sentence, "...provided it does not adversely impact existing residents."

Page 54. Affordable Housing Millage. This is a misstatement. City Council has redirected (stolen, in my opinion) these funds for a voting center and inappropriately used them to pay off land purchase bonds, so the amount of purported funds for actual housing are much less than stated. Let's be honest about the funds that may be available in the future (assuming no more misappropriation), or not say anything because this total level of funding is not available for developing housing.

Page 61. 1.1, Paragraph 1. Minimum lot sizes should not be reduced and triplexes should not be allowed in these areas. Duplexes can work within current standards (height, setbacks, etc.) with minimal impact on adjacent neighbors; triplexes are too much and are unnecessary overkill.

Page 61. Diagram of “Five costs associated with development”. This is missing the tax issue, specifically when the tax lock expires upon land transfer. Another significant cost factor, and it’s ongoing.

Page 61, Zoning Reform Toolkit. This list/toolkit from the APA is just that—a list of possible actions, but it’s subject to specific situations where an action makes sense. In Ann Arbor R-1 zoning areas, reducing width and area, eliminating parking requirements, and providing density/height bonuses make no sense.

David Gregorka
gregorka@me.com
734.355.6269 (cell)