

MEMORANDUM



TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Brett Lenart, Planning Manager
Michelle Bennett, Principal Planner
DATE: February 18, 2026
SUBJECT: Edits for Draft # 4 for the Public Hearing

Upon receiving the fourth draft of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, Planning Commissioners were asked to provide specific edits that would be considered at the public hearing. Below is a list of the edits submitted. Staff recommends the following disposition of the edits provided:

Edits that are **highlighted green** can be considered “scrivener’s error” and do not require discussion nor a vote. Staff will make all these adjustments in the final published document.

Edits that are **highlighted blue** are staff-supported. Planning Commission members, if in agreement, can make a motion, second to discuss and then vote on the blue edits together. If Commissioners desire to make small adjustments, then staff proposes that friendly amendments be sought to the original motion. In the event that Commissioners desire a fuller deliberation, staff recommends the applicable edit number be removed from the motion and grouped with the purple edits.

Edits **highlighted purple** are where staff disagree and/or believe the proposed edit warrants focused discussion and deliberation by the Commission.

	Page	Edit	Rationale
1	Pg. 7	City seal/logo is very low resolution/blurry – replace with a better one.	Looks unprofessional
2	Pg. 18	Footnote 2: link is broken	Error
3	Pg. 19	Footnote 4: link is broken	Error
4	Pg. 21	Remove extra space from “...hospitals) contribute...”	Extra space
5	Pg. 59	Walk Score ranges in the key are wrong. The numbers jump from 29 (Car dependent) to 50	Error

		(Somewhat Walkable). Need to be fixed.	
6	Pg. 72	Footnote 1: link is broken	Error
7	Pg. 74, fourth bulleted par.	Provide clarification of who/what designates both SmartZone and Opportunity Zone areas.	It's not clear if this CLUP would create these zones, or if they were established by the state of Michigan, or the federal government (or the city, under some other program...the current zoning code?).
8	Pg. 85, fourth bulleted par.	Insert "landmark trees," after quality open space (i.e., "...loss of habitat, quality open space, landmark trees, and tree canopy."	Commenters have emphasized that they are especially concerned about the loss of landmark trees (like large, old, burr oak trees) as well as tree canopy and other natural features.
9	Pg. 88	Suggest edit: Aging housing stock poses a costly challenge for many homeowners, as older homes and buildings often suffer from inefficient and leaky roofs, windows, and building envelopes.	Copy edit
10	Pg. 91, call out box	Remove periods from ends of bullets 1 and 3	Inconsistent use of periods
11	Pg. 116, Transition section	It supports a variety of building types near transit to enhance walkability, increase transit use, and strengthen commercial activity along key corridors and nodes.	Missing comma after "transit use" – oxford commas are used in this document
12	Pg. 116, Hub section	It supports the highest development intensity to improve mobility, activate key centers, and strengthen regional connectivity	Missing comma after "key centers" – oxford commas are used in this document
13	Pg. 122	Under Primary Uses/Buildings, last bullet, add hyphen to "short-term"	Hyphen is used in all other instances. This will make search more consistent for those looking to see where Short-Term Rentals are addressed in the CLUP.
14	Pg. 122, Transition intent	It supports a variety of building types near transit to enhance walkability, increase transit use, and strengthen commercial	Add oxford comma

		activity along key corridors and nodes.	
15	Pg. 124, Hub intent	It supports the highest development intensity to improve mobility, activate key centers, and strengthen regional connectivity	Add oxford comma
16	Pg. 136, 1.1.1	Suggest: Review and rewrite the zoning code to remove barriers to housing development and redevelopment for needed housing types. Consider:	The “considering” in current sentence doesn’t flow with how the bullets are written
17	Pg. 138, 1.3.1	Suggest: Develop and adopt incentives that grant increased development density and flexibility with the achievement of measurable sustainability outcomes	Replace current comma with “and” for readability
18	Pgs. 144, 5.1.1 & 148, 7.1.1	Change SPARK Ann Arbor to “Ann Arbor SPARK”	SPARK Ann Arbor not correct name
19	Pgs. 9, 17, 20, 26, 53, etc.	All the maps are very low-resolution and pixelated (except for Future Land Use Map on page 115). Replace with higher-resolution maps.	If you zoom in to see the information, it’s sometimes really hard to see what the map is trying to show.
20	Pg. 14, graph	Remove “% Ann Arbor Share of County Population” header	This isn’t actually on the graph – either remove this from the legend or add the data in
21	Pg. 24, caption below map	Delete “Old” before West Side.	Correcting an error noted by a public commenter: the larger African American population was found historically in the “West Side,” referred to today by many as the Water Hill neighborhood,” not the “Old West Side,” which was settled primarily by German immigrants.
22	Pg. 24	Suggest sentence edit: The evolution of its historically Black neighborhoods serves as a microcosm for how various city policies have not only displaced communities but also reshaped the fabric of urban life—including zoning, housing affordability, social cohesion, and transportation	This sentence caught my attention this time as not being clear – missing em-dash and the end clause needed amending (removed “as”)

		infrastructure—and offers a learning opportunity for a new path forward.	
23	Pg. 26, map of neighborhoods with racially restrictive covenants	Revisit this map and provide a correct display of areas that had (or continue to have) racially restrictive covenants.	The map provided on pg. 26 does not match the map displaying areas with racially restrictive covenants provided by https://www.justiceindeedmi.org/maps-and-data (i.e., the data source for the map provided here)
24	Pg. 37, bottom right-hand corner.	Remove the cryptic graphic of an upward pointing hand.	There are no other similar graphics in the plan, and it is not clear what this particular image is supposed to mean (except perhaps to convey some kind of subliminal message...?).
25	Pg. 47, second paragraph	Delete the parenthetical phrase “— whether it is related to carbon neutrality or natural features mitigation —”	It may be appropriate to state that requiring every housing development to meet every metric may not be possible, but it is not clear why carbon neutrality and natural features are the two examples—and the only two examples—offered to make that point here, except to suggest that those two goals are the only two goals that will be sacrificed for new housing. It need not be the case that carbon neutrality or natural features must be sacrificed to develop new housing, and the plan certainly should not call out and specifically state that they will be (and are the only other goals to be) sacrificed for new housing. The parenthetical phrase is not needed to make the point, and it pre-determines making tradeoffs that may not need to be made.
26	Pg. 56, second par. of Historic District sidebar	Replace the first sentence with: “Most of the city’s historic districts are located...”	Correcting an error noted by a public commenter.
27	Pg. 56 “Did you know” box	Suggest sentence edit: While not part of a local zoning code, historic districts function essentially as overlay districts, where the more restrictive requirements of either zoning or historic preservation govern.	Hard to decipher as written

28	Pg. 60, third par.	Delete the sentence: “This plan takes no position...historic districts.”	This sentence was first offered and inserted as a good-faith statement to address concerns raised by historic district advocates that the plan was calling for the removal of historic districts. Since then, the commission added additional language that better clarifies the relationships between the comprehensive plan, zoning, and historic districts, and that acknowledges the importance of those districts to many residents of the city, in balance with the city’s housing development goals. Given that added language, this sentence no longer serves its original purpose, seems out of place here, and is arguably inconsistent with the following text.
29	Pg. 66, third par.	At the end of this sentence: “This may include identifying and redistributing land and facilities to better serve neighborhoods” add the following: “, recognizing that the city must follow proper procedures for acquiring and reallocating parklands, and that – by city charter – it cannot sell public parklands without a majority vote of its citizens.” (Cite to pp. 70-79 of the 2023-2027 PROS plan.)	Many commenters are interpreting statements like this as laying out a hidden agenda to sell off city parks for new development. But this plan specifically coordinates (and incorporates) the city PROS plan (on the following page), which establishes proper procedures for actions such as reallocating parkland use. The PROS plan also clearly explains that city parks cannot be sold without a popular vote. Neither of the qualifications requested here are currently made in the CLUP (that I could find). Adding them here would better address citizen concerns regarding conservation of parklands, open spaces, and the natural features they encompass.
30	Pg. 68, first par.	Rewrite the start of this paragraph to read as follows: “The city has an opportunity to repurpose underutilized public and institutional lands, such as parking lots, underused school and institutional grounds, and open areas that require maintenance but that provide little ecological benefit, to support opportunities to provide complete, walkable	The revision here makes for a longer first sentence, but it explains immediately and directly what is meant by “underutilized public and institutional lands” (i.e., <i>not</i> city parks or high-quality natural features), rather than doing so later in the paragraph. Again, this kind of language appears to be suggesting to some commenters that the plan has an agenda to sell off (or develop) all of the city’s public lands. This revision remains faithful (I think) to the original intent of the paragraph, but it avoids doing so in a way easily misinterpreted (I hope).

		neighborhoods that are well-served by transit and high-quality community amenities. To do so, the city should evaluate its public lands in alignment with land use priorities and explore the repurposing of such underutilized spaces. This evaluation should explore....”	
31	Pg. 85, eighth bulleted par.	Delete “in the short term” at the end of the last sentence.	Commenters have expressed concerns that increasing bike lanes and pedestrian safety have and will continue to make driving automobiles through town more difficult. I don’t recall anyone qualifying that concern as a “short term” concern only, and it shouldn’t be qualified as such here. (I’m noting that as an avid cyclist and pedestrian throughout town, while recognizing that such facilities do indeed slow down auto traffic—to some extent by design.)
32	Pg. 86, first bullet	Replace with the following: “Ann Arbor is home to significant natural features, including endangered species habitat, floodplains, woodlands, landmark trees, steep slopes, watercourses like the Huron River, and wetlands. Many of these features are already under public ownership.”	This rephrased list corresponds to the seven natural features currently identified and protected through the UDC, protections which were developed through extensive study and input provided by the city’s natural features master plan. (Those protections are noted in a later bullet and the sidebar, but not explained fully in either place.) It would be appropriate to note them here in full and as already recognized by the city through those other efforts.
33	Pg. 98, first par.	Insert “landmark trees” (i.e., “woodlands, landmark trees, steep slopes...”)	The city’s natural features protections currently include protections for landmark trees, and the planning commission has had no deliberation over removing or minimizing the protection of landmark trees; they should be noted here along with the other existing natural features protections listed. (Note that landmark trees are mentioned specifically below.)
34	Pg. 100, second par.	After the second sentence, insert the following: “...ecological benefit. The	Too much of the public debate has been framed unnecessarily as a need to impose a zero-sum proposition, where

		city should also explore opportunities to provide education and incentives wherever feasible to allow redevelopment while also protecting trees and other natural features in ways that safeguard ecological values, promote climate benefits, and enhance property values. Within its parkland..."	we can either provide more housing development or we can protect natural features, but we cannot do both. I do not believe that it always will be—or that it always need be—just that case. While I’m often skeptical of “win-win” claims, I also believe it may be possible to facilitate both new development and meaningful onsite-natural features protections (in ways that do indeed enhance amenity features and thus property values once projects are finished). We should at least make a statement like this, encouraging the city to find ways to facilitate such win-win propositions whenever possible.
35	Pg. 117	Preferred Bldg Form for Transition, 2 nd bullet should read: “Building height dynamic relative to proximity to Residential category”	Decided at the table 11/18/2025
36	Pg. 117	Zoning for Transition should read: “New mixed-use district(s) that may self-regulate height when adjacent to established Residential category, may provide a variety of place types to emphasize or limit distinct land uses.”	Decided at the table 11/18/2025
37	Pg. 122	Under Form & Site Considerations, 1 st bullet should read: “Building height dynamic relative to proximity to the Residential category.”	Decided at the table 11/18/2025
38	Pg. 123	Caption for 1107 S University should read: “High-rise Mixed-Use Building.” Delete “*when adjacent to Hub”	Decided at the table 11/18/2025
39	Pg. 136, Goal 1.1.1	Insert “unduly burdensome” before “barriers.”	The plan should not call for removing <i>all</i> barriers in order to promote housing development, and some of the barriers the city must impose will necessarily be “burdensome.” The city should not, for example, remove the “barriers” related to building in floodplains, even though those barriers may make construction more expensive or time consuming (if

			possible at all). The language here should be properly tempered.
40	Pg 138	Fill in the actions 1.3.3. and 1.3.4 with the timeframe 1-3 years	There were no timeframes associated with these actions
41	Pg. 142, Goal 3.1.2	Revise to read: "Through inventory and evaluation, and consistent with the city PROS plan, identify suitable redistribution and reprogramming of public parks to improve access to park resources citywide"	Trying to make this shortened statement of the goal more consistent with the longer discussion presented above (including requested revisions to specifically link this goal to the PROS plan)
42	Pg. 142, Goal 3.2.1	Insert "landmark trees" between "woodlands" and "floodways"	See reasoning for requested modifications on these goal statements above
43	Appendix – Community Engagement	Accept track changes	
44	Pgs. 84, 102, 154, 156	Goal 11 should say: "Reduce and ultimately eliminate emissions through the phasing out of fossil fuels and their replacement with renewable energy."	Decided at the table 1/6/2026; OSI supported this change.
45	Pg. 136, Goal 1.1.1, first bullet	Revise to read: "Reduce or remove minimum lot sizes, adjust setbacks, and tailor other requirements to allow more flexibility in the built environment, <u>while exploring ways to avoid unnecessary zero-sum trade-offs between new development, renewable energy, and natural features</u> "	The text of the plan already notes that care should be taken to avoid zero-sum trade-offs between allowing new buildings and shading existing solar arrays; that consideration (along with finding ways to avoid undue zero-sum trade-offs regarding new building and natural features more broadly) should be acknowledged here