

From: Mary Durfee
To: Planning
Subject: Infrastructure
Date: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 2:49:38 PM

To the hard working members of the Planning Commission,

I appreciate all of your hard, and sometimes seemingly unappreciated, work on the CLUP. I am sorry that many find it difficult to deliver their concerns in a respectful manner.

I spoke last night about infrastructure and I have pasted my comments below. At the time, I had not seen the article in Mlive on the issue of the need for a sewer system upgrade to accommodate the U of M's new dorms, some of which are scheduled to open next fall.

This is exactly the problem that concerns me. In this case, the university had OHM Advisors perform the sewer analysis presumably because of the size of the project, the location, the age of the infrastructure in this part of town, and the number of future inhabitants...or perhaps because it was a requirement in the permit. Surprisingly to me, the study is now available years after the project was started.

But with incremental growth due to smaller apartments, duplexes, etc, replacing single family homes, what do we know of the capacity of storm water drains, water, and sewage in these areas? How is this evaluation taking place and how is it connected to the zoning and permitting process?

Thank you for your many hours spent developing this document.

Mary Durfee
1052 Olivia Ave

I would like to speak to the section on infrastructure, specifically pages 90 and 91. I have expressed my concerns about infrastructure to you on multiple occasions. I am aware that large construction projects, such as the high rises around S University, must replace current infrastructure to increase capacity. However, I am concerned about more incremental issues across the city.

At a third ward coffee hour in March of this year, Mr. Jordan Roberts mentioned ongoing evaluations of AA underground utilities. I am assuming that that work is ongoing and that the city is aware of neighborhoods in which ground water or sewer systems are at or near capacity.

Given that, I had hoped that more neighborhood capacity would have been addressed in the current draft. Upon reviewing it, I was disappointed. There is a sentence stating the following: "Any implementation of this plan must carefully align with analysis and projections of infrastructure investment needs and coordinate zoning with capital improvement planning."

I would like to feel confident that capacity of neighborhoods, not just the city at large, has been evaluated and that zoning and/or permitting will not get ahead of that capacity. For example, if a given neighborhood or sewer system has the capacity for usage by 100 more residents, I would hope that any upzoning allowing single family homes to be replaced by larger structures that could house more than 100 people would not occur without first upgrading the capacity. That is, infrastructure should be improved before zoning changes are made, rather than waiting until after sewer systems overflow into residents' basements. Specific language in the plan stating that upzoning will wait until infrastructure is ready would be reassuring.

Finally, the map on page 91 for some reason focuses on placement of resilience centers. Perhaps this is where residents go when the sewers back up? In keeping with other maps in the Plan, it would be more informative if this map could instead show the degree of additional densification that the existing infrastructure can support in each of Ann Arbor's neighborhoods (e.g., 10% more, 50% more, etc.). This would give us a better sense as to what parts of the city are best poised for densification, and whether parts of the city most desired to be densified are ready.