

Ann Arbor City Council Regular Session: March 16, 2026
Email Redactions List Pursuant to Council Resolution R-09-386

Sent Time	TO	From	CC	Redactions	Reason for Redaction
7:04 PM	City Council All	Ryan McGavock		Personal Information	Privacy
7:10 PM	Ginny Rogers	Jenn Cornell		Personal Information	Privacy
7:31 PM	City Council All	Daniel Rubenstein		Personal Information	Privacy
10:12 PM	City Council All	Noemi Barabas		Personal Information	Privacy

From: [Ryan McGavock](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Cc: [Briggs, Erica](#)
Subject: Support for Ann Arbor for All Comprehensive Plan
Date: Monday, March 16, 2026 7:04:24 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

This message was sent from outside of the City of Ann Arbor. Please do not click links, open attachments, or follow directions unless you recognize the source of this email and know the content is safe.

Hello,

My name is Ryan McGavock and I live in Ward 5 in the Eberwhite neighborhood.

Like many families nowadays, ours is a blended one.

We are often dreaming of living closer together, and living closer to work and school.

We drive across town often, but would prefer to walk or bike more, if we lived closer and had safer streets.

We want to walk to a corner store for quick groceries.

We want our kids to walk safely to school or to their friends'.

We want our grown kids to start their own families nearby.

We want to care for our aging parents nearby.

This is entirely possible if we allow for building more creative housing, and for shops and cafes within walking distance.

I support the proposed land use plan because it will create the flexibility to build that Ann Arbor desperately needs.

Thank you for listening!

Ryan McGavock

[REDACTED] Ann Arbor MI 48103

From: [Cornell, Jenn](#)
To: [Ginny Rogers](#)
Subject: RE: Comp Plan Support!
Date: Monday, March 16, 2026 7:10:17 PM



Cornell, Jenn reacted to your message:

From: Ginny Rogers [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, 16 March 2026 15:52:47
To: City Council <CityCouncil@a2gov.org>
Subject: Comp Plan Support!

This message was sent from outside of the City of Ann Arbor. Please do not click links, open attachments, or follow directions unless you recognize the source of this email and know the content is safe.

Council Members and Mayor -

As you are poised to adopt the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, here's one last message of support from me. I appreciate all the effort that has gone into creating this plan which I believe is a major improvement over our current plan. I think it does a good job of meeting our vision of an Ann Arbor for All, guided by our values for a more affordable, equitable, sustainable and dynamic city. I'm ready to get to work on implementation of the plan and hope you are too!

Thank you!
Ginny Rogers
Ward 4

From: [Daniel Rubenstein](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Fwd: March 16, 2026 Agenda - PH-2
Date: Monday, March 16, 2026 7:31:37 PM
Attachments: [HDs & Zoning.pdf](#)
[AAPA Flyer.pdf](#)
[AAPA CLUP Amendments v3 11-11-25.pdf](#)

This message was sent from outside of the City of Ann Arbor. Please do not click links, open attachments, or follow directions unless you recognize the source of this email and know the content is safe.

I am resending this during the March 16 City Council meeting so it is included in the citizen input materials associated with the minutes on Legistar. Note it includes three attachments which should also become part of the record.

Daniel Rubenstein

From: Daniel Rubenstein [REDACTED]
Date: Fri, Mar 13, 2026 at 4:43 PM
Subject: March 16, 2026 Agenda - PH-2
To: <citycouncil@a2gov.org>

Dear Ann Arbor City Council,

I am writing regarding the Public Hearing-2 item on your March 16, 2026 agenda, Resolution to Adopt the City of Ann Arbor's Comprehensive Land Use Plan - 2050. I believe the Plan is seriously deficient in its treatment of historic preservation. This was pointed out to the commission, but they instituted only modest, largely cosmetic changes. I urge you to send the Plan back to Planning Commission to bring how it treats historic districts and historic preservation up the standards of peer cities and best practices.

I am a member of the steering committee of the Ann Arbor Preservation Alliance but do not speak for them here. I also live in a historic district, which I bought into well after its establishment, choosing to surround myself with three-story multiplexes of the kind the Plan promotes as ideal for residential neighborhoods. I am a firm believer in human-scale density - even literally in my backyard - and walkability. That is not incompatible with valuing historic preservation.

The two major outstanding issues are: (1) Historic districts should be in the Residential land use category, not the Transition category, consistent with their built environment (issues like industrial uses and short-term rentals may be addressed within the Residential category), and (2) The Plan is silent about bolstering preservation programs, outreach, and education, including for historically marginalized groups (about which Minneapolis's oft-cited plan speaks eloquently). Additional issues include that the Plan is an outlier in emphasizing modifying districts, offers no guidance on conflicts between historic district guidelines and underlying zoning, and does not explain the well-documented benefits historic districts contribute to the Plan's core values of affordability, sustainability, equity, and dynamism. Addressing the first two issues is critical, and addressing all these issues would make Ann Arbor a leader in integrating historic preservation progressively into a pro-housing and affordability agenda.

The Alliance has documented all these issues at <https://www.aapaonline.com/land-use-plan-zoning>. Within that, there is a one-pager focused on zoning, a two-pager explaining my points above, and a longer background document documenting peer cities' plans and best practices, which I am attaching here for your reference and for the record.

The bottom line is, Planning Commission has not articulated any compelling reason to deviate from best practices so dramatically. Regarding land use categories and subsequent zoning in particular, not only do peer cities state their intention to align both with historic district rules, but this is a best practice advanced and explained by the National Trust for Historic Preservation. The only reason proffered to place historic districts in the Transition category has been, essentially, "historic districts may not be

around forever," which is wholly inconsistent with many council members' statements that they "support historic districts." Support is incompatible with planning for and assuming historic districts' demise.

To anticipate objections, (1) Downtown has misaligned zoning, but its historic district guidelines explicitly state criteria for modifying buildings, including height restrictions and upper floor setbacks. Misaligned zoning is particularly dangerous without such protections. While I strongly oppose violating best practices by misaligning zoning, short of that, the Plan should, at minimum, explicate intent to implement protections in historic district rules; (2) Only 2.4 percent of Ann Arbor's land is devoted to historic districts, and they contain a higher proportion of multi-family and group housing than the rest of the city (data from Michelle Bennett). They are not a significant driver of housing scarcity in Ann Arbor. While districts are close to downtown, that is true of almost all historic districts in all cities; cities begin at their core. Other peer cities do not view that as a reason to undermine their protection, as they are a major part of what makes their cities unique and attractive to begin with.

There may be other objections, which I am happy to address. But I would urge you to take a slow walk around the Old Fourth Ward and the eastern portion of the Old West Side, both of which are placed in the Transition land use category, to take in exactly what makes them so special. They evoke the city from the mid-19th to early 20th century, and are only getting older and rarer with each passing year. While the OWS was historically a German neighborhood, there are other groups whose history has not been equitably preserved; the work is not "done," but is ongoing, something other cities recognize. Progressivism shouldn't mean jettisoning our history. Historic districts can accommodate more housing (infill with multiplexes, internal division, ADUs, replacement of non-contributing structures, etc.) yet not be put in a land use category so inconsistent with their built environment. In addition, the Plan should acknowledge the benefits of historic preservation for affordability, sustainability, equity, and dynamism, and plan for education and outreach, particularly amongst historically marginalized communities (Ann Arbor for All). We can simultaneously be leaders in historic preservation best practices and add much-needed housing. These values need not be seen or treated as contradictory. We should genuinely support preserving the important history of Ann Arbor on an ongoing basis, as other cities do. Preservation should not be sacrificed in the name of progress, something progressives have long recognized. I urge you to send the Plan back to Planning Commission for appropriate revisions.

Daniel Rubenstein
Ward 5

From: [John Pianelli](#)
To: [Briggs, Erica](#)
Subject: City of Ann Arbor - Affordable Housing Feedback (Elephant in the Room)
Date: Monday, March 16, 2026 8:55:27 PM

This message was sent from outside of the City of Ann Arbor. Please do not click links, open attachments, or follow directions unless you recognize the source of this email and know the content is safe.

Hi Erica, just like the national legislation / executive order limiting how many single-family rentals can be owned by investors/landlords. The State of Michigan and/or City of Ann Arbor should limit how many single-family rental homes can be bought and/or owned by the numerous rental companies that rate predominately to University of Michigan Students. We know the names of those companies and many of their properties are unkempt and is disrepair.

I mentioned this to the City Council and the Mayor a few months ago. What is needed is courage to do what's right.

Thanks for asking for feedback on this important issue. Another suggestion is to annex Ypsilanti into Ann Arbor.

From: [A2 Automation No Reply](#)
To: [Taylor, Christopher \(Mayor\)](#); [Disch, Lisa](#); [Harrison, Cynthia](#); [Mallek, Jon](#); [Watson, Chris](#); [Radina, Travis](#); [Ghazi Edwin, Ayesha](#); [Eyer, Jen](#); [Akmon, Dharma](#); [Briggs, Erica](#); [Cornell, Jenn](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Landuse Plan - Pause the plan
Date: Monday, March 16, 2026 10:12:27 PM

Name: Noemi Barabas

Subject: Comprehensive Landuse Plan - Pause the plan

Message:

I was the caller who could not unmute. This is what I wanted to say: Everybody here seems to agree on the goals of this plan. But we disagree whether the plan will actually get us there. In our country we see dishonesty that route resources to the wealthy. Now, the same priorities of the dishonest and wealthy are may be here in Ann Arbor and in this instance in the form of this land use plan. It is not enough for most of it to be honest and helpful. All of it has to be honest and helpful. We won't be able to fix the problems after it is approved. I like many things in the plan. But: its not done yet. I am against approving this plan now for these reasons: 1. Process - dishonesty and exclusion 2. Affordability Dishonesty and exclusion: The claim that this will help us better afford housing is dishonest. The claim that all current parks are accounted for and protected is dishonest. The claim that citizens are listened to is dishonest. Affordability: I will not give you statistics. I will give you a data point. We bought it as freshly graduated students! Our house in our neighborhood would be unaffordable to us with our career income if we were to buy it today. Think about it. This plan seems to join the trend we are protesting on No Kings marches. Vote No to fix the plan: with honesty, participation and making sure that city wealth serves the majority of residents with normal income.-

Email: [REDACTED]
Phone: ([REDACTED])
Address: [REDACTED]