

Response from activity - From Now to 2050: How should growth happen?

Includes responses from events and online. Response count: 61

1. We want to see how you would distribute 75,000 new residents in the city by development type. Imagine you have 15 tokens, each representing 5,000 people, to distribute where you think growth is most appropriate. Since the potential for growth is limited in each area, you can place up to: 10 tokens in Neighborhood Scale Residential Infill 14 tokens in Mixed Density Neighborhood 14 tokens in Higher Density Neighborhood The total number of tokens must add to 15.

Area Type	Total Tokens
Neighborhood Scale Residential Infill (yellow)	36
Mixed Density Neighborhood Scale Multifamily (orange)	40
Higher Density (red)	39

2. Please explain why you distributed the tokens the way you did:

1	Diverse city and diverse needs requires different housing options
2	Fuck single family homes. Sooo unsustainable
3	High density development allows the greatest number of people to live close to jobs and amenities at the lowest cost and environmental impact.
4	Higher density housing near transit, education, employment, and healthcare will reduce transportation demand and improve affordability. Much of the growth in population is student and young professional, but housing stock is limited due to challenges with aging in place, smaller family sizes, and skyrocketing prices for building and renovation. In-fill is good to attract people living in the suburbs and working in Ann Arbor to have opportunities to buy/rent closer to their jobs while retaining suburban amenities, but would be insufficient to meet changing demographic demand for housing.
5	Higher density is closest to university/main working locations, and I think short commutes are important
6	I feel higher density is more fitting for the types of population likely to come in (students & others).
7	I like the design of neighborhood scale residential infill more than buildings. I recognize that buildings create more compact, housing options, which is beneficial to reduce land use. If there is a way to provide the benefits of open green spaces to building residence, then mix density or higher density housing would be fine.
8	I see benefit in all housing types, but think prioritizing residential infill will help preserve the charm & feel of AA
9	I think all predominantly SFR neighborhoods should scale up density to include small apartment bldgs, duplex, townhomes
10	I think there's a lot of infill we could do without changing too much with good mixed use. The operative word being good. We need lots of family friendly town homes and apartments. By family friendly I mean NOT 5 over ones with poor sound insulation nor double loaded corridors. High quality town houses on individually owned lots with brick party walls or point access block apartments. Point access would require a change in state law, but it's one of the best ways to add density without changing the character of neighborhoods and should be a top legislative priority of the city.
11	I think you can really increase density with row homes, duplex, triplex in neighborhoods - and this would keep the neighborhood "feeling"

12	I understand the need for high rises to accommodate a lot of growth, but they block so much sun to the streets below. The fewer, the better, so make them efficient. Apartment complexes and condos are a much more welcome type of housing
13	I want to see Ann Arbor move away from commuter culture and toward 15 minute city style developments. Developing high-density mixed-use areas within the city will promote local economic growth while reducing car dependency.
14	It feels like the low density neighborhoods are also the wealthiest and hardest to purchase property
15	Plenty of people are attracted to Ann Arbor because it is its own suburb. They will want to live in the neighborhood scale residential type area. Those people who want to be in Ann Arbor but cannot afford a house, will pick mixed density scale options. And lastly, MANY of us who have lived in Ann Arbor long term are upset about the expansion of 5 story high rises outside of downtown. We are Ann ARBOR, our buildings should not tower above the trees! We should be able to see trees through the buildings!
16	Prioritize densifying single family housing and bringing amenities (corner stores, small restaurants, etc) into existing neighborhoods w/increased foot/bike traffic
17	Sick of high rises & the endless construction on major roads. I think a lot of the neighborhood/residential areas could fit more units.
18	Slightly more emphasis on the fewer higher density areas, as well as the more ubiquitous infill areas, in order to support transit. Orange areas do not seem as clearly tied to existing transit patterns.
19	Taking low/not used area and putting housing.
20	There is already a lot of high-density options in downtown, and these are already expanding. They are also mainly targeted at students, not residents of Ann Arbor. There is already a lot of yellow on the map, though the idea of having more neighborhoods and single-family housing is appealing. I just know that any new homes in this category will not be affordable for the average person. I would appreciate more investment in the middle option, and to have more of these available in all parts of Ann Arbor.
21	There need to be more housing options that are not owned by landlord complexes/buildings, as in my experience it often leads to lower quality of living.
22	To accommodate various needs and wants.
23	We should distribute among all neighborhoods, but focusing on increasing units and affordability in areas where lots already live
3. Do you have other ideas/concerns about the future growth of the city?	
24	Balancing transit with public, cars, bikes/walking with
25	Build up not out! Keep green zones around the city - decrease regs to allow homeowners to densify their property
26	Don't plan like Ann Arbor Public Schools
27	Homes that are purely AirBnBs (not student housing) need to be reassessed for the value they bring to the community.
28	I personally want a policy that new construction cannot be taller than the tallest tree within 50 feet of the building.
29	I want to live in a walkable area of Ann Arbor so badly, but I am forced to live outside and commute in due to the cost of housing. Please give strong preference to many local developers rather than a few large corporate developers.

30	I'm concerned about the expansion of high-cost homes in Ann Arbor which will cause more affordable housing such as apartment complexes, condos, or other mixed-density housing options to be forced outside of Ann Arbor. If I ever want to buy a home, I could not afford one in Ann Arbor, which is the city that I work in and would like to live in.
31	I'm concerned that downtown is defined much too small. The entire area between Hoover and Depot and State and Main should be D1. Our economy is dangerously dependent on the fortunes of the university and we should aspire to be more like Austin by creating opportunities in the greater downtown area with more housing and much more office space. There should be lot of startups coming out of the University that should be able to setup shop here.
32	If the city can work with planners and architects to streamline the permitting process and develop model designs for low cost, energy efficient, 1-4 unit small scale residential buildings, it would encourage individual property owners of modest means to consider building infill housing on their existing single family parcels.
33	Improving the public transportation system needs to be an upfront investment before and during increase in density, as opposed to a response to perceived demand. The systems to support car-lite (e.g., single car for a household or shared cars for a co-op) or car-free living need to be in place before people move in or we will be building in car dependency and traffic even as we invest in the opposite. Also, additional parking spaces increase rent for apartment buildings whether or not they are being used, so reducing parking is an easy lever to improve affordability for new construction and renovation.
34	Is it possible to grow up instead of out to keep more land available for trees in Ann "Arbor" and incorporate building greenery on the sides and top of new construction?
35	My main concern is rent inflation. We also need affordable housing desperately. We need new housing. I think co-ops are important & another viable avenue for growth.
36	Putting large apartments within a neighborhood when you can gently increase density with other options
37	The city should prioritize capping the amount of buildings that can be bought by corporations vs single families/individuals.
38	Worried about environmental impacts of big growth and about preserving character of the city to some extent? Need actually affordable units. Also worried about how Umich will continue buying up land
39	area and money demands.
40	cost of living and cost to purchase
4.What neighborhood do you live in?	
41	Orchard Hills
42	Ann Arbor Hills
43	Arborview
44	Bunker Hill Road
45	Lakewood
46	Northside
47	Ann Arbor Township
48	Broadway Street
49	Bromley
50	Burns Park

51	Garden Homes
52	Georgetown
53	Glacier Highlands
54	Hearthstone (off Packard and Stoneschool Rds)
55	I live in Pittsfield township (Platt/W Michigan ave), so not in an Ann Arbor neighborhood, but I would like to live in Ann Arbor
56	King
57	NE
58	NE: Plymouth/Green
59	Near North
60	Newport West Condos
61	Old Fourth Ward
62	Old West Side
63	Riverside in Ypsilanti
64	South University Burns
65	Spruce Knob apartments
66	Stadium and Packard (South Park Subdivision)
67	Throughout the city in single-family neighborhoods
68	Thurston/Orchard Hills
69	Turnberry
70	Ward 5 @ Revena & Arborview
71	West A2 (Pauline & Stadium)
72	West Side
73	Ypsilanti
74	woodside meadows

5. How do you feel about allowing up to 4 units in neighborhoods that are currently zoned exclusively for single family housing?

Option	Responses
Strongly Agree	22
Somewhat Agree	10
Somewhat Disagree	2
Strongly Disagree	22

6. How do you feel about this scenario?

75	As long as it looks and feels like a residential home, I think it would be fine to have a 4 unit complex in the same lot
76	Existing quads and townhouses fit fine into the neighborhood fabric.
77	Getting rid of exclusionary zoning is long overdue, for all the obvious reasons of social equity, economic growth, environmental impact, and individual property rights.
78	Great, I think we should be de-suburbanizing as much of Ann Arbor as possible
79	I do not like it at all. Lakewood is a family neighborhood community, and on the literal edge of the city. We want it to stay that way out here.
80	I don't want multiple housing units in my neighborhood
81	I think having more mixed housing is good for many reasons. It provides avenues for people to talk, cohabitate, interact w/more & likely diverse populations.
82	I think this would be fine as long as they are sold at reasonable amounts and not sold to corporations.

83	If the bad/poorly maintained student housing houses are sacrificed for nicer, larger complexes, that would be ideal, accessible, and safer
84	If there are noise rules and people choose to live there it is fine
85	It makes sense if the property & area can support it. Especially buildings that can blend in with the existing buildings.
86	It would mix different types of residents together, which could create some for concerns single families.
87	It's a good solution to Ann Arbor's current housing shortage
88	Keeping sustainability, equity, and affordability in mind, it seems that a good first principle would be to move away from single family housing as the extremely prominent default.
89	Love it!
90	Not enough space
91	The lots in this neighborhood are gigantic. One was bought recently by the family next door to build a private tennis court...we need housing! And more housing in these expensive areas may free up more affordable units elsewhere? I don't imagine AA Hills becoming affordable any time soon...
92	This is fine. I live next to a non conforming duplex on Coler and it's fine. The only issue--and it's minor--is that the unit next to my house only has on street parking. This wouldn't be an issue except the street will sometimes fill up with people going to York. So permits for on street parking ought be part of any such plan.
93	This would provide more opportunity for those who cannot afford single-family homes to live in a neighborhood community within Ann Arbor
94	Ultimately (theoretically) quadruples housing supply. Why stop at 4?
95	We have a housing/affordability crisis - why are we not already adding more housing wherever we can?!
96	strongly support!
7.What are the potential benefits? What are the concerns?	
97	Increased housing across what is currently R1 is critical to Ann Arbor's affordability. Exclusion-based zoning, as defined for R1 is currently applied to 70% of all land parcels in Ann Arbor, only 20% of parcels are zoned for multi-unit housing. This is not equitable, and has led to a housing shortage for Ann Arbor. While the business case for teardowns and new construction of multi-unit homes is not compelling, it can occur on an in-fill basis. Where property owners want to build 2-plex or up to 4-plex units, they should be permitted by right for it, tear-downs or new builds. These will still be at market-rate for the highest bidder, but they will increase the housing supply and reduce the rapid price escalation of single family homes in Ann Arbor. Without significant more supply, the median price of an existing home on the Ann Arbor market will be over \$750K by 2030, if not over \$1M by 2030. The U-M could grow by 2050 between 35K - 75K more employees and students. The demand-based price escalations will only continue without significant more housing supply being developed.

98	It is a necessity to start infilling multi-family developments into single family neighborhoods. There is a demand for housing in these neighborhoods, but there is little to no space to grow. Without adding housing in these districts, housing costs, already too high, will increase further. Expands housing supply in the types of neighborhoods that a portion of the population prefers. By increasing supply, at or above the increase in demand, home prices in these areas should stabilize. While we believe infilling these neighborhoods with smaller multi-family developments is necessary, we expect that public resistance will make this type of growth difficult. The example you request feedback is about 4-unit developments in presumably single-family neighborhoods. But the issue isn't the quantity of units. The issue is about the design or form of the buildings, the setbacks and the height. Aesthetic multi-family buildings can be accepted in single-family neighborhoods.
99	increased housing decreased cost/property value better transport options - having large buildings placed within a neighborhood
100	4 units isn't enough, density needs to expand rapidly, there are almost no downsides, people need to live
101	A benefit is denser housing to fit more people. Concerns are noise and small-ness of houses.
102	Accessibility Affordability Sustainability Chronic construction
103	Ann Arbor's infrastructure cannot sustain denser housing. Look at what recent development have done to Washtenaw Ave. Congestion. It's getting even [illegible] with development on Platt
104	Benefits are a richer community that can create opportunities for new businesses and/or community events. Concerns would be noise level from parties in units that would primarily be occupied by college students.
105	Benefits: Reducing suburban sprawl, strengthening the local economy, and building more socially connected communities. Concerns: Mostly cars. Without proper transit investments and mixed-use zoning adding new housing may further clog our roads and promote parking development instead of more housing/businesses
106	Better options using city, UM, AAPS, WCC and church parking lots near existing jobs
107	Character of neighborhood would be negatively impactd. Parking - too many residents, too many vehicles, vital to preserve our parks. Noise pollution from Plymouth, Green, Nixon Rd M-14 is already very bad. Transportation to and from A2 should be bigger part of the solution
108	Concern about lack of parking with increased density, concerned about safety of walking and biking with increased density. Concerned about enough retail grocery stores to accomodate increased density
109	Denser living conditions is the benefit, It would be nice if it still had community feel (like a public garden for those 4 units to use or curated and maintained flower beds and decor).
110	Departure from most housing in MI. Street parking overwhelmed/ because of not knowing neighbors, lot of transients. No benefits. New population of renters have no stake in their building or the city. Don't want NYC.
111	Diversifying the neighborhood, allowing seniors to downsize, while allowing new families to move into the area
112	Encouraging street level retail as much as possible will benefit both local businesses AND residents. We must avoid building greater density while maintaining the old car centric mentality. We need policies that encourage an increase in the number of people and a decrease in the number of cars in our city. This could take the form of limited street parking permits and parking maximums.

113	I don't like it. Benefits are few: increase tax base may look like a benefit but in the long run will [illegible] greater increased costs both for monetary outlays and loss of green space, increased stormwater and sewage treatment. Maybe a louder voice in state politics. Concerns: loss of significant natural features including trees and increase in traffic, need for parking, decrease quality of life, more transience, greatly increased need for waste disposal, the start of decay pollution
114	I feel the city would be taking away an important quality of life for residents. Lack of space for vehicle parking. De-stabilizing neighborhoods. Decreasing quality of life. More renters - renters not given to maintaining property or long term care of property
115	I strongly agree, especially when you see home values ticking up over \$700k. How are working class supposed to afford that when their budget is typically \$150k to \$250k?
116	I'm sure some homeowners have concerns of devaluing property values but it is a grave mistake to resist city development and urban pedestrian experience upgrades because of financial assets speculation of only one type of demographic
117	If these are owner-occupied I am in favor. Not more small rentals within neighborhood or owner lives in at least one of the units
118	Increased density can justify new and existing amenities, such as populating the local schools, using neighborhood parks and bus lines, and attracting small businesses. Want to retain the community as mostly long-term residents (including stable rentals) and avoid big corporate landlords, so that new and existing residents have shared experiences. Historic redlining and gentrification need to be grappled with. Keep neighborhood streets low-speed and avoid cut-through traffic to maintain pedestrian and bicycle safety, especially near the schools.
119	More housing, better use of space? Ppl will flip out, cars/parking/traffic concerns
120	More housing, more affordability Parking concerns
121	More livable and diverse neighborhoods Increased affordability less commuting traffic more transit support
122	More neighbors would allow more transit and neighborhood retail to be better supported. The typical concern I hear - parking - is overstated in my opinion. I think the real adjustment many fear making is the simple fact that they would be living in close proximity to an increased number of people, and all the potential concerns that come along with having more neighbors (noise, etc.). It's much easier to wrap your head around having a neighbor on each side of your fence, and these scenarios probably seem "out of control" compared to that relatively simple, 2-neighbor scenario.
123	More people who want to live in Ann Arbor would be able to; more neighborhood commercial, such as Argus Farm Stop, could be supported; This could go even farther than 4 units
124	No benefits. Concerns about pollution, mental health, no trees (replaced by housing). I happen to know people prefer to live outside of Ann Arbor 1. they have farms, 2, they prefer lower taxes, 3 they prefer single family housing with lower cost 4. they can always drive to A2 or Detroit to see football games/shows
125	No benefits. Higher population density means more traffic, less open space, less nature, and less ability to let children go out and play safely.
126	Overcrowding Noise
127	Parking
128	Parking concerns, plumbing overflow, storm drains. Neighborhood is not designed for more density. We all have mandated sump pumps that easily fail. Do not want density where I live.
129	People care about sound, a coffee shop or grocery store does not produce sounds.

130	Potential benefits presumably include more tax revenue, which presumably would be useful for all residents. Concerns are possible disruption of the lives of many current and future residents. The "before and after" images on the next page "Ann Arbor needs new housing" show most of the original homes disappearing. Do current residents realize this possible or probably future disposition of their property? We have been told enough about consequences. We have not had real discussions with city officials, based on first principles. Real discussions or real arguments must be begin with first principles.
131	See previous comment.
132	Terrible plan. Parking is a big problem. I like knowing my neighbors. Increased transience inability to know 100 units is not appealing.
133	The benefits would be allowing families to become homeowners. My concern would be corporations exploiting local residents and furthering the income divide in our country.
134	The issue for me personally would be, how "imposing" would a structure next to me be...not how many units it has. I'd rather have a 20-unit brownstone/rowhome that's 35' tall than a 45' 6-unit apartment building right on the property line. Please focus on height & setback not # of units.
135	There would be benefits as it would bring more people into the city, and those of us who are affiliated with the University could live closer to work/school. The only concern I can imagine coming up is from people who currently live in single-family home neighborhoods who want to keep more people out of their neighborhood and gatekeep living in Ann Arbor from people who do not make six-figure salaries.
136	This is a terrible idea and should be abandoned. The whole premise is wrong. Asking people what they'd like is completely different from what they'll do (or can afford to do). Make the town more affordable by reducing property taxes and unnecessary spending, not increasing density and lowering property values. Do not destroy the neighborhoods.
137	Too few parking spaces for 4-unit lots
138	Want to preserve existing home values and nature in current neighborhood. More high density housing in areas like downtown and close to campus would help with the growing population
139	We should do away with single family residential zoning and go to form-based zoning.
140	benefits: few concerns: increasing transients
141	inadequate remaining lot size or green spaces increased parking on the streets
142	no potential benefits
143	not good, I want to maintain the character of my neighborhood - single family home. Parking is one concern, increased transience is another concern
144	partial solution
145	with growth plateauing premise is incorrect that it needs new housing. Parking on streets will become a problem. Ambiance of neighborhood will be lost.
8. Check the types of housing above that you would like to see in your neighborhood	
Duplex A two-household dwelling where two homes are attached by a common wall.	27
Triplex and Quadplex A multi-family building with 3-4 units. Often, these units are either stacked on top of each other or next to each other.	27
Small building	18
Medium building	15
Large building	14

9. What do you like/dislike about these housing types in your neighborhood?

Duplex

146	Already exists and is fine.
147	Basically a home with two doors, that's great
148	Fits more people with less space
149	Fits the existing building designs
150	Improve density on existing lots, fit in with existing fabric
151	Increased affordability & density, supports more local businesses
152	It fits well in our moderate size lots while also increasing density
153	Likely opportunity for someone to purchase their first home
154	Still feels like a home in a neighborhood community.
155	These are good options, though what is gained isn't too much more than leaving the single-family homes.
156	This type of housing cannot be considered without other factors being included
157	not dense enough to be worth developing
158	probably easier to build, cheap (?)

Triplex & Quadplex

159	Additional dwelling, may sometimes lead to more disarray from each tenets belongings / preferences
160	Fits the existing building designs
161	Increased affordability & density, supports more local businesses
162	Likely opportunity for someone to purchase their first home
163	More affordable access for families nearby schools, width and height close enough to fit into neighborhood
164	Ok, but a little too small with housing space.
165	These work best if there is an ally behind them
166	This is also a good option, for the same reason as Duplexes.
167	Too tall for a neighborhood community.
168	nice size within the context of my area
169	seems good for students

Small building (under 10 units)

170	Could fit in very sparingly but wouldn't mesh next to ranches and small SFHs, might be nice with mixed-use zoning for hyper local businesses to open
171	Does not fit the current nature, green, intertwined-with-nature design.
172	I like these for older arterial road like Packard and Liberty
173	Increased affordability & density, supports more local businesses
174	Likely opportunity for someone to purchase their first home
175	No. These are apartments or offices. These break up a neighborhood.
176	Starts to remove the green space, but isn't the worst
177	These are fantastic options as it is not too many people, but still provides the opportunity to many to live in a neighborhood.
178	Too big for a residential SFH area so far removed from Ann Arbor.
179	nice size within the context of my area

Medium building (10-20 units)

180	Does not fit the current nature, green, intertwined-with-nature design.
-----	---

181	Feels like neighbors will not get to know each other and children don't have a place to go outside and play that the parents can watch from the windows.
182	I am downtown! Houses divided into apartments sucks!
183	Increased possibility of being owned by a corporation
184	Large influx of people, places to park vehicles, and much more concrete to green space ratio (in a bad way)
185	More condos available to buy/rent
186	These are also fantastic options, for the same reasons as above.
187	These would work as a series of point access blocks strung together
188	Why would we prohibit these anywhere?
189	Worried about HOAs or corporate landlords bullying the rest of the neighborhood, difficulty integrating new residents into the neighborhood
190	good investment
191	too large for my area due to the underdevelopment of transit/necessary businesses within walking and biking distance and thus would only congest the city further
Large building (over 20 units)	
192	Belongs closer to transit and jobs
193	Building in right locations (major/transit served streets) and/or with right form (setbacks, etc.) becomes more important as the building sizes increase.
194	I want my neighborhood to remain single family units
195	I would not mind more large buildings, but would prefer small-medium sized.
196	Increased possibility of being owned by a corporation
197	Just not 45' I think? I don't care how many units, just how much it would shade my house.
198	MAKE AFFORDABLE
199	More units = more affordability :)
200	No. Too big, too tall, too impersonal.
201	Same as medium, except worse
202	These are fine, but ideally ought have underground parking garages.
203	These would be taller than the trees.
204	good but you need a lot of space
205	ideally most housing, we need more desperately, good for students
206	prefer these downtown or along major transit lines
207	too large for my area due to the underdevelopment of transit/necessary businesses within walking and biking distance and thus would only congest the city further
208	we should bring as much density as possible

