

Public Comment Tracking Spreadsheet

Source	Chapter	Comment	Response
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	Collapsing our residential neighborhoods into compact and suburban is great. But a complete (walkable) neighborhood requires more mixed-use. Could all compact neighborhoods be zoned Neighborhood Centers? Or expand those zones. They seem few and far between right now. Maybe also allow for parcels bordering those areas to be rezoned through Administrative Departure? We want to grow and upzone them over time, so building in a process to do so seems wise.	Compact neighborhoods allow multiple zoning districts that would accommodate more than residential uses. Future changes would be determined through subsequent updates to the zoning ordinance. Rezoning cannot be approved through administrative departure—this is guided by the Michigan Zoning Enabling Legislation that requires City Commission consideration.
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	What happened to eliminating requirement minimum parking throughout the city? While solving the problem may be a chicken and egg problem, eliminating zoning as the barrier and allowing builders/developers to make that decision seems wise.	The CMP takes all public comments into consideration. The Plan relaxes parking requirements but acknowledges the concerns of many residents about a total elimination in all areas.
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	Why are we preserving setbacks instead of eliminating or relaxing them? I just sent in a detailed letter explaining how this conflicts with the goal of building visible housing and results in drastically less space to actually build housing on. The feedback from the CMP Engagement sessions clearly supported eliminating them from the code, so I'm shocked to find the first 3 design guidelines explicitly calling them out to be preserved. This seems like a big miss and is something we should rectify before the CC votes on the final draft.	As the City grows and density increases, light and air remain important. Setbacks will be reviewed in a future zoning update. The CMP recommends setbacks as one potential strategy to meet qualitative guidelines for new development.
Online	(5) Desirable Development Character	the future character/land use maps are not colorblind friendly	The online map will take this into consideration. An option to filter the view of character types will be provided for legibility.
Online	(4) Balanced Mobility	The City of Grand Rapids shall adopt a NACTO standard through policy or legislation in the next 5 years. With such, state and federal funding may be used to design complete streets, and road reconstruction projects which receive MDOT funding need not conform to AASHTO design standards.	Outside the scope of the CMP.
Online	(4) Balanced Mobility	The City of Grand Rapids shall pass cycling safety legislation that requires the implementation of dedicated bicycle lanes on every street reconstruction project. Accountability is needed.	Outside the scope of the CMP.
Online	(2) Vital Business Districts	Allow accessory commercial units and live-work units at every intersection, regardless of what vital streets street type an intersection consists of.	This is ultimately addressed through updates to the Zoning Ordinance. We received support through this process for small businesses in more areas, will be explored through the zoning re-write to understand potential barriers. Recommendation 2.A.5 has been updated with this direction.
Online	(2) Vital Business Districts	Allow micro businesses everywhere.	This is ultimately addressed through updates to the Zoning Ordinance. We received support through this process for small businesses in more areas, will be explored through the zoning re-write to understand potential barriers.
Online	(4) Balanced Mobility	Eliminate parking requirements in business districts.	The CMP considers all public comments. The Plan relaxes parking requirements but acknowledges the concerns of many residents about a total elimination in all areas.
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	Allow more home businesses categories. We have noise and nuisance codes — USE THEM and not just zoning to deal with issues.	The recommendations were developed following extensive public engagement. The zoning ordinance provides a tiered path for home businesses and other home occupations. The zoning rewrite will explore additional opportunities to understand potential barriers.
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	Allow all missing middle home types on every vital street type and in every neighborhood zone type.	The recommendations were developed following extensive public engagement, and balance the desires of a diverse community.
Online	(3) A Strong Economy	Allow live-work units everywhere.	This is ultimately addressed through updates to the Zoning Ordinance. We received support through this process for small businesses in more areas, will be explored through the zoning re-write to understand potential barriers.
Online	(4) Balanced Mobility	Grand Rapids' residents want rail. Construction of a commuter rail line connecting Grand Rapids to Holland, Kalamazoo, Lansing, and Detroit would be game changing to attract talent and retain educated workers. Pursuit of such a project shall be written down in the master plan to have a great chance of securing federal grant funding. One requirement of federal transportation grants is acknowledgement of the project in long-range planning documents.	Outside the scope of the CMP.
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	<p>Compared to other countries in the world but similar to other cities in the United States, we have an unusually high level of legal separation of residential from other land uses and an unusually radical way of legally guarding the single-family home from all else. How do other countries zone? Well, countries like England, France, Germany, Sweden, Russia, Japan, and Australia have residential zones, too, but these "residential" zones are not so exclusive. In Germany, the residential district is a misnomer: Planners allow nonresidential services that serve the everyday needs of the neighborhood residents, such as grocery stores, bakeries, restaurants, doctor's offices, and nondisruptive industries. This creates a walkable environment, where residents can access a nearby bakery by foot since it is close to their home.</p> <p>My concern is whether zoning is bringing about the benefits originally promised. Zoning was invented as a municipal tool promised to mitigate urban pollution and improve public health and safety. If we classified activities on land in a certain way, certain benefits would follow, such as separating homes from polluting and hazardous production activities, like oil refineries and steel mills. With this in mind, why are many everyday activities banned from residential zones then? Are neighborhood bakeries on street corners hazardous for public health? Do small medical offices give off noxious fumes? What public health problems are solved by legally banning multi-family homes from low-density residential areas? What level of car dependence are we reinforcing through zoning uses far, far away from each other? Has zoning frozen our city in a sepia toned polaroid picture, with preservation of the status-quo as the principal reason for zoning the way we do?</p> <p>The zoning code of Grand Rapids should not have LDR and MDR zone districts. All residential only zones should be updated. In each LDR and MDR zone,</p>	Zoning specifics are outside the scope of the CMP.

Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	The future trajectory of zoning in Grand Rapids is likely going to remain a local issue. The United States has no federal law on urban land use. In 1926, land-use control through zoning became legal in Euclid v. Ambler, but zoning remains a local matter. Zoning is not a glamorous topic, but it is an important one. It determines how our built environment looks, which shapes our everyday life. It is a tangible policy. Wish your neighborhood had a coffee shop within walking distance? Well, if that spot in mind is zoned low-density residential, too bad. It is illegal. Thank zoning. I know I wish I had third-places within walking distance to meet my neighbors at	Noted
Online	(4) Balanced Mobility	We need connected bike lanes. Our network is extremely disconnected.	Noted
Online	(6) Area Specific Plans	I'm concerned we will not have enough parking for Butterworth and Front Street employees. Mainly because we already don't have enough parking before any of these changes are made. As much as you want to push towards biking and mass transportation we will always need personal vehicle parking for our employees as they go between our sites. There is no better way to force business out then removing parking.	Noted
Online	General Comment	I greatly appreciate the existing crosswalks and bike lanes and welcome more, BUT...use of and laws around them need to be regularly and very obviously communicated. PATROLLING AND STIFF FINES NEED TO BE ENFORCED!!!! I regularly have to play crosswalk chicken with and yield to vehicle traffic where they should be yielding to me.	Outside the scope of the CMP.
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	I love trees and I like the idea of increasing our tree canopy, but better tree management is needed. I don't want to see the race to achieve the proposed percentage of tree canopy at the expense of removing trees where needed for both economic and aesthetic reasons. Some goals to consider are removing trees where they pose potential damage to the electrical system. I would like to see a study of the impact of power outages to our community. Power outages cost residents spoiled food, work loss, cold stored prescription loss, cost of temporary shelter, and many other reasons. Currently trees are trimmed around power lines, but trees grow and future trimming is needed, the cycle will continue with increased cost every time a tree is trimmed, some trees need to go. It is good to see that newly planted trees under power lines are a shorter variety. More of this needs to occur, remove mature trees and install a responsible height tree. I live on Fountain Street where we have many trees trimmed in the shape of the letter "Y" I would like to see these removed, why is the "Y" tree accepted as a quality aesthetic. The Y tree actually enhances the ugliness pf the power lines. Replace these with Dogwood or Redbuds.	Outside the scope of the CMP.
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	I do not support the increased density, by right, within LDR neighborhoods.	Noted
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	I do not support increased density based solely on the vital streets designation.	Noted
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	I would love to see corporate ownership of our residential neighborhoods limited and monitored closely due to poor management practices, which lead to very unkempt appearances and a lack of pride amongst our citizenry. Strict code compliance should be mandated from the onset to deter the financialization of residential and income properties. Other municipalities have taken steps to deter the blight corporate ownership brings and I think Grand Rapids can too.	Outside the scope of the CMP.
Online	General Comment	I strongly believe that the city of Grand Rapids and MDOT should conduct a Full Fair Study of All the Alternatives concerning the US131 renovations where it passes through the mid-town area . The possibilities of a Boulevard should Not be overlooked.	Noted
Online	(6) Area Specific Plans	REGARDING INDIAN VILLAGE!!!!!!! 4-unit apartments should be allowed 'by right' in Low Density Residential (LDR) neighborhoods. ABSOLUTELY NOT 6-unit apartments should be allowed on 'Link Residential' roads (Okemos, Menominee, parts of Chesaning and Shiawassee) ABSOLUTELY NOT	According to the Grand Rapids Coalition to End Homelessness, a count conducted in January identified 1,139 individuals experiencing homelessness. The draft Community Master Plan aims to expand housing options, which could help stabilize or lower housing prices that have surged in recent years. This approach will also provide housing that accommodates changing household structures, including an increase in non-family households. The benefits extend beyond those without homes; older residents looking to downsize, young individuals starting their careers, and middle-class professionals such as healthcare workers, firefighters, and teachers can all find suitable options. Additionally, this initiative seeks to address historical segregation, providing more equitable housing opportunities for non-white residents. In 2018, Minneapolis implemented similar city-wide changes and became the only growing housing market in Minnesota that did not experience significant rent increases over the following five years. The draft plan proposes gradual, neighborhood-specific changes to enhance housing options, focusing on incremental and infill development rather than large-scale transformations. This approach suggests the addition of accessory dwelling units, often referred to as "granny flats," rather than extensive new construction. It's important to note that multi-family housing does not necessarily mean rental units; for example, a duplex could be constructed as condominiums with both units owner-occupied. Zoning laws do not dictate whether housing is for rent or for sale.
Online	General Comment	There is no good reason to crowd more people and more traffic into any existing successful neighborhoods. For example, the Burton & Breton area is already very busy with traffic and has plenty of housing. Neighborhoods in that area should not be changed into apartment zones.	See line 25
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	I don't support the push for extra density in single family neighborhoods	Noted
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	Do you agree that up to 4-unit apartments should be allowed 'by right' in Low Density Residential (LDR) neighborhoods (Indian Village is wholly in an LDR neighborhood). No	Noted
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	Do you agree that up to 6-unit apartments should be allowed on 'Link Residential' roads (Okemos, Menominee, parts of Chesaning and Shiawassee). No	Noted
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	Regarding 1B2. I live in an LDR neighborhood and enthusiastically welcome the development of a variety of housing options within my neighborhood.	Noted

Email	General Comment	Why in the world would you destroy one of the stable neighborhoods of family homes in Grand Rapids? This neighborhood does not have room for building apartments. And I hope the idea is not to turn family homes into multifamily apartments. We have fought to keep large parties from renting homes. Renters do not take responsibility for lawns/property and there are too many cars per property. Traffic gets out of control and there is too much parking on the road. Please reconsider this proposal. We want to keep our neighborhood for single family homes.	See line 25
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	CAAP is mentioned several times. I can't find the updated one on city's website. Is that available to the public now?	https://www.grandrapidsmi.gov/Government/Departments/Sustainability/Climate-Change/Climate-Action-and-Adaptation-Plan
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	Sections 1.C.8, 9, 10 relate to climate adaptation goals that are out of step with current city civil engineering projects. How will this shift in the future to embrace the city's CAAP to include native plants into infrastructure in place of current practices to manage heavier water events by speeding up the flow of water with ditch building, installing hardscape and removal of native plants in favor of hydro-seeded grass? Also, would highly recommend adding Calvin College/Plaster Creek Stewards to section 1.C.9 as they are heavily involved in water management for the Southtown section of the report.	On-going discussion is needed between City Departments to coordinate/reconcile City policies to implement this recommendation.
Online	(6) Area Specific Plans	I live in Indian Village. I do not support 4 or 6 unit apartments in low density residential neighborhood or on link residential roads. We already have high traffic due to neighborhood schools, especially near the high school, and the roads are not safe for our children to play. Apartments would increase traffic and further create unsafe roads.	See line 25
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	This chapter opens with an expansive definition of what a great neighborhood is; and then it never mentions retail or commercial uses and how they can be integrated INTO a neighborhood. The plan has too great an emphasis on developing centers rather than allowing things to evolve as fits a neighborhood. The centers are too widely dispersed to be the sole anchors of the neighborhoods.	The chapters of the CMP work together to address the city as a whole. Commercial uses are allowed in the appropriate zoning districts identified for the compact neighborhoods.
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	What about broadening the categories of home businesses, micro-retail, corner stores, or accessory commercial units? 1.A.6 talks about amending state policies regarding inclusionary housing policies [so the city can allocate more power for itself], but why not also advocate for reasonable building codes; things like single-stair buildings or residential codes for up to four unit buildings. Older neighborhoods contain many quadplexes, and they are not burning down.	This is outside the scope of the CMP. The city will evaluate specific bills regarding changes to the building code that may increase the supply of housing.
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	1.B.2 We already allow these by right based on street category; so this is not a "bridge to the future" but a bridge to now. We need to also address square footage per unit requirements or this higher density of missing middle is still not actually available. Requiring 8,000sq/ft for a fourplex is not allowing density, there are very few 8,000sq/ft lots.	Dimensional standards will be addressed with a future zoning update.
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	1.A.7 "Consider changing density and development patterns in response to metrics for City services" This statement is dangerous and should be removed from the plan. This is a license for bureaucratic meddling in land-use under the guise of whatever 'metric' the planning department or city commissioners dream up. No. Draft rules clear enough to be understood, simple enough to be managed [contrary to the current ordinance], and applied consistently. One of the principle promises of zoning is predictability, this undermines that goal which the ordinance already fails to support.	This recommendation allows for needed adjustments to public services (such as first stations) in response to a growing population. The wording has been clarified in the updated plan document.
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	1.8.3 ". Consider allowing up to six units on lots fronting Link Residential and Network Residential streets in all zones where single-family detached dwellings are permitted." . . . the city already did this. Why is this in the Bridge to the FUTURE? But this change was poisoned-pilled by sq/ft-per-unit requirements, for almost all lots on those streets this change made no difference. It is rarely financially feasible to tear down a single-unit structure to build a duplex. A duplex + and ADU means multiple water and sewer connections at a high cost. There is not really a path to higher density missing middle created by these changes - which, again, we already did. Why does the plan mention maintaining setbacks - a specific requirement - but not mention changing sq/ft-per-unit requirements?	Dimensional standards will be addressed with a future zoning update. Setback language will be revisited.
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	1.8.4 A pattern book? More rules? How does that facilitate innovation? That is not how innovation works. Also if plan is so focused on things like setbacks, and will not address loosening sq/ft-per-unit or height requirements, this is all hand waving; it will not result in either "innovation" or additional housing.	Dimensional standards will be addressed with a future zoning update. Setback language will be revisited.
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	There is no mention of getting rid of parking requirements for new developments. How can we ever be sustainable with so much parking? One parking spot could be a rain garden and a tree. Three parking spots could be a community garden. Four parking spots could be another townhouse. We are missing out a more livable, sustainable, active and healthy community by not being specific about getting rid of parking requirements. Aging is place is great--yay for that in this section of the master plan--but part of aging well is staying active, and that's harder to do in a city full of parking lots.	This is addressed in 4.C.1 "Allow vehicle parking reductions or eliminations as an incentive to encourage infill development."
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	We cannot have climate mitigation and sustainability without supporting parking minimums. No building owner should HAVE TO build more parking spaces than they need or want. It has become clear that parking mandates do more harm than good, increasing development costs and removing high-value real estate from more productive uses. Parking lots are covered by impermeable pavement. This prevents infiltration of stormwater and creates runoff that can contribute to surface flooding and water pollution. Additionally, the predominance of pavement in an area is directly related to the "urban heat island effect," which substantially increases local surface temperatures as well as ground-level ozone pollution on hot summer days. Michigan can encourage sustainable development, decrease housing costs, and generally encourage healthier, more livable communities by repealing parking mandates and employing market-based principles to manage public parking. Parking mandates often preclude cities from developing in a way that	Noted
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	Parking mandates impact the environment indirectly by contributing to a cycle of automobile-centric development and cultural practices. The phenomenon of induced traffic demand related to road widening is well known. A related concept is induced parking demand. By assuring that people find free parking spaces, along with the resultant low-density land use that makes non-automobile travel inconvenient or impossible, parking mandates induce automobile trips and parking use that would not otherwise have occurred. This creates congestion, which traffic engineers address with road widening, which induces more traffic, which creates a need for more parking. The end result of this cycle is a sprawling urban form entirely oriented around automobile travel. Anyone capable of making a trip by car is encouraged to make that trip by car. Cars pollute. Even electric cars contribute to noise pollution, as well as air and water pollution through brake and tire dust. I want to live with the freedom of not having to own a car. Right now, I do not have that freedom in Grand Rapids. Car ownership is required to participate in society in Grand Rapids. Even the CEO of The Rapid as well as its board members do not ride the bus to get from place A to place B in Grand Rapids.	Noted
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	Eliminate parking minimums.	Noted

Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	Enforce existing laws and ordinances and hold landlords more accountable. Implement speed bumps at major intersections and on neighborhood streets. Improve the water utilities infrastructure (lead pipe removal). Create a city owned cement repair company to service the area and provide cost controlled solutions for homeowners. Inspect rental properties every 5 years for code compliance and to determine drug houses.	Outside the scope of the CMP.
Online	General Comment	<p>The first sentence under "Relation to Other Plans" on p3 is: "This plan serves as the overall framework for growth within Grand Rapids." Assuming "growth" without explanation is a terrible way to start. I suggest replacing that overused and dangerous term with "improvement and sustainability". The sentence will then read: "This plan serves as the overall framework for improvement and sustainability within Grand Rapids."</p> <p>Replace this section of the Community Vision Statement [p12]—"have the opportunity to live in safe and affordable housing" with the following: "are guaranteed decent, safe, and secure housing".</p> <p>Rationale: Housing is a basic necessity, and as such is a human right. It is not enough to provide "opportunity" for housing when, due to circumstances largely if not wholly beyond their control, some are not able to take advantage of that opportunity—as is presently the case for more than just "some" residents.</p> <p>Under "Balanced Mobility" [p13] add the word "sustainable". Given the present prevalence of ecosystem-destroying motor vehicles, the City should continuously reinforce the idea that we need to quickly and greatly reduce the use of such vehicles.</p> <p>1.a.1 p25 "...to create and permanently preserve quality affordable housing..."</p> <p>Why: We've lost a lot of previously affordable housing because it was only preserved as affordable for a limited time period, and that time period has run out for most of that housing. This might be done through public ownership, a community land trust, and/or a stable and reliable nonprofit agency.</p> <p>1.a.2 Incentives yes, but minimize regulation that is not necessary to create and preserve decent affordable housing. In our capitalist society regulation is necessary to protect the public interest and especially those most vulnerable. Beyond that we are over-regulated. This applies to much more than physical design.</p> <p>p35: "Here the plan once again touts growth" as "vital". On the contrary, it is generally destructive. I suggest reading Eben Fodor's 2007 book Better NOT Bigger and Jason Hickel's 2020 book Less Is More: How Degrowth Will Save the World.</p> <p>p44 and 45: Corridor Improvement Authorities should not give yet more taxing power to "business leaders". That is already a serious and long-standing problem with the Downtown Development Authority and similar TIF authorities. Keep basic taxing decisions in the hands of elected representatives of the citizenry.</p> <p>p51, 3.c: The title is outrageous: "Balance economic growth with priorities for the environment". The economy should be sustainable rather than always grow, and must work within a decent, well-protected environment/ecosystem. To "balance" the human-made economy with the ecosystem that sustains us is simply ridiculous, and to pretend we can do so is dangerous. That mindset has done a great deal of damage to date, and will only do more damage as long as our approach does not fundamentally change.</p> <p>Re Mobility section - You should recommend and emphasize full cost pricing - include the "external" costs of ecological/environmental and social degradation.</p>	The process requires striking a balance to be responsive to the diverse opinions about growth within the Grand Rapids community. The vision, values, and goals statements were tested through a robust engagement process. These line edits have been seriously considered and incorporated where appropriate.
Email	General Comment	Multi-page letter asking to change the language in the draft master plan and explicitly call for either eliminating or relaxing/shrinking required setbacks. Full PDF saved separately.	As the City grows and density increases, light and air remain important. Setbacks will be reviewed in a future zoning update. The CMP recommends setbacks as one potential strategy to meet qualitative guidelines for new development.
Online	General Comment	I would like to push for rapid development of housing units, both with public and private funding, to keep downward market pressure on rents.	Noted
Online	General Comment	I would like to push for advancements in walkability, biking, and public transit, with less focus on parking and car infrastructure needs. Increased density is important for this.	Noted. Relevant recommendation are included in Chapter 4, Balanced Mobility.
Online	General Comment	I would like to push for a full service grocery store to be located downtown to serve residents within walking/biking distance.	Outside the scope of the CMP. The Plan does not give direction at this level and the City cannot require a grocery store to location downtown.
Email	General Comment	I am Deb Mo0re, head of the Neighborhood Watch group for Indian Village, bounded by Burton, Breton, 28th St. and Plymouth. Many neighbors are asking me for clarification of what LDRs may mean for our neighborhood. If I sell my house, for instance, can someone buy it, tear down the house, and build apartments on the lot?	See line 25
		It is disappointing that people in the City of GR, do not assess the real "crux" of the issue. Here are the problems:	See line 25
		<p>1. Companies like BlackRock, State Street and Vanguard are buying personal residences all over the country. They then rent out these properties at very expensive prices. As a result, this inflates the price of real estate and, as a result, precludes many people from being able to afford a home. In addition, it also drives up rental costs. And, the financial backing for this behavior comes directly from China.</p> <p>2. Democrat politicians enact policies that drive up inflation - thus the price of goods and services increases dramatically. This is what we have been experiencing over the past 3 years with the current administration. In addition real wages have not kept pace with real estate appreciation, so it makes it harder for people to purchase property and/or real estate.</p> <p>3. MI is a sanctuary state. That means it accepts illegal immigrants. This is not good and just places an unnecessary burden on the legal citizens of our city and state. We need to stop providing refuge for those that come into our country illegally. Legal immigration is a bedrock of our nation and all communities can embrace and accept those that come in legally and assimilate into our culture.</p> <p>4. Capitalism has always worked. What you are talking about is very Socialistic or Marxist at its core. Those who have saved and have the means are the ones that buy real estate. It is not our obligation as a city to provide adequate housing to those who cannot afford it. In addition, this is what the church is for. Churches should be looking out for their members. If there is a need, it is great when a community of Christian believers rallies around them to help them find adequate and affordable housing. We need to teach these folks "how to fish" rather than "giving them fish."</p> <p>Please leave our community alone and focus on the issues outlined above. This is the only way forward for our city and those who are looking for housing.</p>	
Email	General Comment	There are many citizens, like me, that are disappointed in your couching these "housing issues" behind sinister motives.	

		Thank you for taking the time to respond to the Eastgate neighborhood association regarding the recent and unfortunate zoning changes. The City took the wrong path with this issue. Packing more people into smaller areas simply makes urban areas less desirable. Market appeal is influenced by green space and low density. When I studied urban planning in college there was so much focus on green space and generous setbacks. The City of GR is throwing all of this out the window. The people will keep coming regardless, like a dripping faucet that will eventually cause any bucket to overflow. There is nothing wrong with the message "we are full folks".	See line 25
Email	General Comment	This is very poor policy that will make Grand Rapids a less appealing place to live. Traffic is horrible in GR and this will only make it worse. Homes on larger lots in single family neighborhoods will always be more appealing.	
		Why in the world would you destroy one of the stable neighborhoods of family homes in Grand Rapids? This neighborhood does not have room for building apartments. And I hope the idea is not to turn family homes into multi family apartments. We have fought to keep large parties from renting homes. Renters do not take responsibility for lawns/property and there are too many cars per property. Traffic gets out of control and there is too much parking on the road. Please reconsider this proposal. We want to keep our neighborhood for single family homes.	See line 25
Email	(1) Great Neighborhoods	I just wanted to take a second and thank you for all of your excellent communication to my Shawnee Park neighborhood regarding LDR plans. As with all issues that have even a whiff of politics involved, there are many opinions on all different sides of this issue. One thing that I try to keep in the front of my mind when considering issues like this one is what I think my Lord Jesus would say about it. Because if I claim to be a Christian, I have to put my money where my mouth is and support the causes that Jesus supported. Again, there are lots of Christians who will disagree with me, and I'm not in the business of comparing who is the "better" Christian here. But the way I see it, if there is any way to make housing more affordable for my under-housed neighbors, I think it's my Christian duty to support it. But what if it makes my neighborhood more dense? What if it makes my streets busier? What if it threatens my property value? What is the generational wealth that I'm building for my kids by owning a home in a wealthy neighborhood is threatened by LDR plans? Those fears are real, but Jesus tells us again and again: do not fear. He also tells us again and again that our first priority should not be our own comfort or our own interests, but the prosperity of others - particularly that of the poor. I'm wondering if you have any data about the number of people in Grand Rapids who are unhoused or under housed. I'm wondering if you can speak to the ethics behind an LDR plan like this. Could you explain a little bit about how a plan like this would benefit the least among us - as Christ calls us to do? If	See line 25
Email	General Comment	I do not agree that up to 4-unit apartments should be allowed "by right" in Low Density Residential (LDR) neighborhoods.	Noted
Online	(6) Area Specific Plans	I do not agree that up to 6-unit apartments should be allowed on 'Link Residential' roads. The neighborhood of Indian Village is a desirable area due to the schools and single home ownership. Enabling multi-unit buildings will decrease value, add congestion to a busy family neighborhood and not support the community built amongst longtime residents.	
Online	General Comment	1. Kudos on visual data (tables, maps, photos) 2. Audience seems to be fellow city planners, not residents ----terminology & salient issues are unfamiliar ----volume of information is too much ----contextualizing relative to typical resident points of reference in daily life is lacking 3. How about an "X-ray view" of the bare bones: issues & recommendations as line-item, list form. Hot link can go to the full 158pp PDF section corresponding to the one-line listing, though. 4. How about leveraging AI to generate "imagined result" for a neighborhood proposed change: visual gallery. 5. I like the attention to bike and foot traffic, rather than blindly assuming motorized traffic has privilege and priority. 6. I like the benchmarking of peer-size cities around USA (maybe also consider peers outside of USA, too)	The plan will be presented online as a story map for clarity. The plan is used every day by planners and needs to contain the technical language for their use. The online plan will become a more user-friendly public facing medium.
Online	(4) Balanced Mobility	There is no mention of the impact of Winter weather and limited seasonal daylight. Are you planning to ride your bike all year once you're forced to get rid of your car? Or ride a scooter? Or walk a mile to a bus stop? Parking restrictions already have a detrimental impact on people's willingness to shop downtown or in neighborhoods.	Noted
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	There is no mention of the impact of foreign investors or equity firms buying up housing which results in individual buyers being crowded and priced out. This is a serious problem. Large rental agencies purchase much of the affordable properties and use monopoly power to increase rents, charge unreasonable fees such as pet rent, and non-refundable application fees. The management companies are often run offshore so service is difficult to obtain for repairs. Chinese investors, because of their government restrictions on investment, buy up land and housing in the US and other countries via internet and without having to get mortgages, making it difficult for domestic buyers to compete. They do this all over the world, to preserve their capital.	Outside the scope of the CMP.
Online	(4) Balanced Mobility	I have lived in 7 different states/cities, and in none of them is the public transit safe. Crimes are frequent both in the vehicle and in the transit to the station. People with disabilities have less access, and are more vulnerable. The duration of an average trip is often twice as long as it takes by car. If one needs to switch vehicles or modes, it is hard for seniors or other people with impaired cognition to safely find their way.	Noted
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	Attached housing is never built with enough sound control to prevent noise from neighbors with common walls to be a problem. Shared outdoor spaces can be monopolized by larger, loud groups that don't take care of the shared areas. Shared facilities for trash and recycling are a mess. Either they are under-sized or people put wrong items in recycling. It's impossible to monitor and enforce.	Noted
Online	General Comment	These plans in theory have many benefits. However, I want to be able to live somewhere safe and quiet, where I have privately-owned, attached space, fenced in so I can let dogs and children out to play without having to stay with them; hang laundry out to dry (energy efficient!) plant food in a garden; and have space for friends and relatives to park when they come to stay. I also need a secure place out of the weather to park my car and bicycles so they aren't stolen or damaged. Most people will want these features where they live. If these factors can be included in the high-density housing, that would work.	Noted
Online	(4) Balanced Mobility	When creating biking and walking spaces, make sure to include maintenance, to keep plants from encroaching into the right of way, and potholes from making it dangerous to ride and walk.	Noted

Online	(4) Balanced Mobility	<p>Are there any considerations for (major) traffic speed reductions (e.g., 25 to 20) and car lane reductions? I have read through the master plan, and it seems to be somewhat implied via (quick-build) installations/interventions (especially at intersections), but I would like to see what I mention be considered/addressed throughout **all** city streets.</p> <p>To exemplify, during my commutes I have identified at least 2 streets that are in dire need for security improvements. Those streets include Michigan and Fulton Street. These are streets that are begging for traffic fatalities/injuries. Its wide and plentiful lanes regularly encourage drivers to drive at least 30+ mph (i.e., fatal speeds) often right next to an unprotected sidewalk (grass does not suffice). Additionally, many intersections that involve Fulton often fail to provide safe and adequate solutions for pedestrians/cyclists crossing, which is definitely not helped by the aforementioned along with a lack of traffic lights. Michigan Street / Medical Mile is similarly in poor shape.</p> <p>I recognize that some streets might not be under the purview of the city - and that is a separate issue, but what I am trying to convey is that whenever a street involves non-drivers it needs to follow fundamental security principles such as 1) "with greater power comes greater responsibility" (i.e., prioritize non-drivers / the vulnerable), 2) secure by default/design (i.e., designs that encourage lower speeds to prevent accidental traffic fatalities / do not rely on individuals and enforcement), and 3) proactive over reactive (i.e., implement security measures before fatalities/injuries occur). Ultimately, speed kills</p>	Outside the scope of the CMP.
Online	(4) Balanced Mobility	<p>When we speak of "balanced mobility", what does "balance" mean? One could argue that we have balanced mobility now, it's just an unequal balance with most preference and infrastructure going towards cars. What balance does the City want to achieve? Your data show that the majority of commutes are under 10 miles, this is a very feasible distance to bike, especially with an e-bike and safe infrastructure. Does the City want to shift its commuting base towards transit or biking? By how much? Do we want to increase transit ridership? I think this needs to be defined.</p>	This will be updated following Planning Commission discussion.
Online	(4) Balanced Mobility	<p>Nowhere in the Plan does it mention funding for transit. I would like to see a goal that says "continue to provide funding to support The Rapid operations" and "continue to fund The Dash", even increase funding to these entities to expand service and frequency, which is a stated goal of the Rapid in their Transit Master Plan! For that matter, suggest "provide dedicated funding for implementation of the Bicycle Action Plan", as that is a crucial missing piece.</p>	Outside the scope of the CMP.
Online	(4) Balanced Mobility	<p>I just wanted to say how important I think transportation is in the future of the city. Simply put, it would make the city a lot better if it was convenient to get around it without driving. To be honest I think that an unreasonable amount of money would have to be spent to make this happen, and I don't think it would pay off right away, but it just feels like such an amazing thing to be able to get on a bus and go where you want to go without having to drive. Knowing you can get to various places of interest in the city with nothing but a bus pass is such a gift and I think transforms how people see a city.</p>	Noted
Online	(4) Balanced Mobility	<p>I just wanted to say how important I think transportation is in the future of the city. Simply put, it would make the city a lot better if it was convenient to get around it without driving. To be honest I think that an unreasonable amount of money would have to be spent to make this happen, and I don't think it would pay off right away, but it just feels like such an amazing thing to be able to get on a bus and go where you want to go without having to drive. Knowing you can get to various places of interest in the city with nothing but a bus pass is such a gift and I think transforms how people see a city.</p>	Noted
Online	General Comment	<p>Hello, I agree with the recent zoning amendments for building types along various corridors in Vital Streets. However, I do not agree with all of the streets designated as Link Residential and Network Residential. Vital Streets mapping was not conducted with FUTURE LAND USE and Building types allowances (nor zoning nor FLU) in mind. Certainly, I know that transportation and land use are connected, but when we created and mapped Link Residential and NW Residential the intent was not to use those as a basis for allowing multifamily by right. Therefore, I would like a SEPARATE MAP in the Master Plan with the Link Res. and Network Res. identified, and some segments removed, i.e.. Robinson from the Terra Building east to Plymouth would be one area.</p> <p>We need to be more fine grained and look at existing BUILT context and not a broad brush with these Link and Network residential corridors.</p> <p>Yes, I'm being a bit of a NIMBY. I have not looked at other Link and Network lines on the map, but I can help modify those across the city if you want to make sure we are not inadvertently labeling some existing, thriving SFR areas.</p> <hr/> <p>1.B.3 Allow higher density residential in the Mid-Century and Modern Era neighborhoods. In line with the Vital Streets Plan, increase density in neighborhoods where adequate transportation infrastructure is provided. Consider allowing up to six units on lots fronting Link Residential and Network Residential streets in all zones where single-family detached dwellings are permitted. New housing should align with the Future Character Map. For example, cottage clusters may be an appropriate solution for neighborhoods where large parcels are available for development.</p>	The Vital Streets Plan (VSP) is the best tool for coordinating land use and transportation in routine decision-making. It provides a connection between uses and infrastructure. The CMP recommends updating the VSP to respond to growth trends.
Online	(5) Desirable Development Character	<p>It is very hard to see the FLU categories with the street labels, specifically the Cesar Chavez corridor. I bet this was hard for folks and maybe results in fewer comments about FLU in that area. Might want to have different labeling.</p>	Noted. The online map will provide alternate options for viewing the map to improve legibility.
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	<p>Attention should be given to burying overhead utilities. Overhead lines negatively impact the tree canopy desires. Research shows that utility pruning of street trees substantially decreases the live span of those trees.</p>	The Downtown Character type provides direction on burying overhead utilities in accordance with Grand Rapids City policy.
Online	(4) Balanced Mobility	<p>Do the economics support large buses. Would smaller vehicles with, potentially, more frequent departures work?</p>	Outside the scope of the CMP.
Online	(4) Balanced Mobility	<p>Bike lanes are a needed, and appreciated, feature. Some logistics need to be considered when developing bike lanes. Additional/frequent sweeping to clear debris from bike lanes since, typically, the lanes are at the bottom of crowned streets. Also consider shortening the "speed humps" so that bicycles can easily go around them.</p>	Noted.
Email	(6) Area Specific Plans	<p>During the CC High Level Briefing #1, Commissioner Goel asked about the word "directing" for 3.A. His point though was that life sciences should be encouraged to be elsewhere in our city, not just downtown.</p>	Evidence from several key life science clusters suggests that proximity is an important location determinant as it facilitates staff movement between clinical, academic, and research roles.

Online	(5) Desirable Development Character	I am a college student who this past Spring studied abroad in Madrid, Spain. During my time there, I stayed with a host mom in a 4 bedroom apartment in a 6 story and 12 unit building. In fact, almost every single building in Madrid is around 5-7 stories. However, my building, similar to most in Madrid, only contained 1 stairwell. This is very common around much of Europe. This type of housing is illegal in Grand Rapids due to Fire Code. The thought behind this Fire Code is that it allows for multiple exits during a fire in taller buildings, especially those made of wood. Much of Europe does not stipulate that taller buildings must contain two staircases as their buildings are made of stone and brick. They also boast similar rates of fire injuries and deaths when compared with the US. I was wondering if it would be possible for Grand Rapids to allow this type of housing. Not requiring multiple staircase for very fire proof buildings allows for taller missing middle housing at cheaper costs. It also allows for smaller scale development as having two connected staircases implicitly requires a hallway, driving up costs. It can be very difficult for potential developers to find large enough plots of land where there buildings may be profitable. The ability to build taller but skinnier buildings in smaller lots may allow smaller and more local developers and landlords to enter the market, aiding in reaching Kent County's goal of adding 35,000 units by 2027. In addition, allowing for smaller taller buildings could create a more cozy and unique vibe/atmosphere to GR. Many have complained that large scale 5 over 1 construction looks artificial and corporate. It may be possible to smaller and more individual buildings could slowly redefine and revitalize lacking neighborhoods that wouldn't otherwise receive investment. I am sure that there are a lot of nuances (and I am certainly no expert) when it comes to thinking about people's safety vs affordability of housing, but I thought that this might be a realistic way to help make GR a little more affordable and nice to live in and I thought I would let you guys know. Thanks for reading this and listening to my comment!	Noted. This is outside the scope of the CMP - building code sets requirements for egress.
Email	(6) Area Specific Plans	https://docs.google.com/document/d/1nOd27F5Mbzfhqusrnpl4sB0RrNyYuOtELnmw0hiUxc/edit?usp=sharing	See line 25
Online	General Comment	Page 3 - relation to other plans, there is no mention of Green Grand Rapids. The efforts of this plan and aspirations for tree canopy and greenspace should be in here.	The CMP draft has been revised to carry forward relevant pieces (i.e., 40% tree canopy) of Green Grand Rapids. The green space requirements have already been codified in the Zoning Ordinance.
Online	General Comment	It seems like a miss that some of these recommendations don't have connectivity to one of the values.	Tagged recommendations indicate that recommended project, policy, or program directly advances that value. Not all recommendations are tagged although they may play a role in upholding some plan values.
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	I greatly support higher density in the Mid-Century and Modern Era neighborhoods - don't lose this.	Noted
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	In 1.C.2 there's mention of "community assets". Please clarify what that means.	This is intentionally broad to allow communities to identify assets. Parks and other gathering spaces are noted as an example.
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	1.C.10 should have mention of a tree ordinance - the plan gets specific in some places on tools that should be considered, but doesn't in other places. We shouldn't allow for developers to take out massive trees without replacement obligations.	This is addressed by the tree preservation requirements within the Zoning Ordinance.
Online	(5) Desirable Development Character	Seems like a missed opportunity to not have transit-oriented nodes on the north side of town with the intent to connect to Walker and GR township and beyond. With lots of jobs on the NW side of town and The Rapid's attempts to bridge public transit up there, a transit-node seems worthwhile. Similarly with heading towards the beltline going north	TOD nodes capitalize on existing infrastructure and higher frequency service. Effort was made to coordinate planning work with the Rapid's long range planning work.
Online	(5) Desirable Development Character	I celebrate the simplification of neighborhoods to "compact neighborhood" as the overlay. I appreciate the need for neighborhood distinctiveness, and we should encourage density across the city.	Noted
Online	(5) Desirable Development Character	Celebrating the future neighborhood development of encouraging infill	Noted
Online	General Comment	There appears to be no mention of historic districts. As someone who lives in one, I'm actually happy that this isn't addressed, because I think it's a tool that can actually prevent affordability and increased density. I don't expect them to go away, but I do hope that as tools are developed to support our community goals, that we don't lean heavily on singular tools.	Noted
Online	General Comment	Does the infrastructure we are starting with, when the plan is inevitably adopted in December, in balance between motorists and someone trying to cross the street?	After a conversation with the Planning Commission, a hierarchy of road users (starting with pedestrians and ending with vehicles) has been added to the Balanced Mobility chapter. Grand Rapids will continue working to build infrastructure to reduce reliance on personal vehicles and improve roadway safety.
Online	General Comment	Is someone operating a 2,000lb vehicle with 400 horsepower and airbags existing in some type of parity with the cyclist on the road?	See line 86
Online	General Comment	Do the investments (\$88,000 for a parking space?) by the city represent a kind of parity between motorists, pedestrians, cyclists? Between services for residents vs. services for visitors vs. services for commuters?	See line 86
Online	(4) Balanced Mobility	Eliminate minimum parking requirements, other cities that have done so are thriving.	The recommendations were developed following extensive public engagement. While the plan calls for reduced parking, it strikes a balance to address current needs and future goals.
Online	General Comment	There is inconsistency throughout the recommendations on how specific things go. I can only hope there is intention behind that, but as someone who develops guidelines and frameworks, this feels like an easy way to get out of certain things or talk around them.	Long-range plans need to be flexible due to the timeframe being planned for. As such, recommendations can lack great specificity.

Email	(6) Area Specific Plans	<p>I am a resident of the Creston Neighborhood and I received an email updating me of the Community Master Plan for the area and asking for public comment. Hopefully you are the intended recipient for these comments :)</p> <p>Thank you for all the work it has taken to develop this plan, I'm sure it has not been easy!</p> <p>One of the main pushes for Creston is to add additional housing, which is great, I've already seen two very large complexes being built this last year on Plainfield. My main concern is that Creston is already the largest neighborhood in Grand Rapids with Plainfield Ave serving as a through-way from both Highways 131 and I-96. I live directly on Plainfield and the traffic volumes are capital L Loud! The road itself is out of shape with humps and bumps and too many manhole covers. A large portion of Plainfield Ave, especially the business corridor between Leonard and Knapp, did not get resurfaced last year when a lot of other roadwork was being done and it really shows. Thousands of cars travel this road every day and I can hear them rattle over every bump.</p> <p>We also have a speeding problem on Plainfield. The road is wide and long, I often see people speeding down the road going 45-50 mph, when the speed limit is 30 mph. There is a shocking lack of police presence in this area. I have not seen a single car pulled over in a traffic stop since 2021. This has caused a portion of the public to take on very dangerous driving practices since they are not afraid of getting in trouble, I'm sure the amount of accidents and driving fatalities will back me up on the increase of dangerous driving in the past few years.</p> <p>All this to say, if we are going to bring even more people to this area, and therefore add even more traffic, I beg of you to put in place measure that won't make Plainfield feel like you're walking down a highway. We need increased police presence, we need police to actually pull people over for driving infractions, we need more trees on the sidewalks to adsorb sound, we need the road repaved and if we are going to increase pedestrian traffic, we need trash cans on street corners.</p> <p>I want to help make this area better for the current residents and any future residents. Please let me know if there is an event planned for direct public comment, as I would love to attend the meeting. I am also happy to talk to anyone else you know that would be interested in the lived experience of a Creston neighbor.</p>	<p>After a conversation with the Planning Commission, a hierarchy of road users (starting with pedestrians and ending with vehicles) has been added to the Balanced Mobility chapter. Grand Rapids will continue working to build infrastructure to reduce reliance on personal vehicles and improve roadway safety. This is further reinforced by the recommendations for Plainfield in the Creston ASP.</p>
Online	General Comment	<p><i>Thank you for your time and effort in community building.</i></p> <p>As our community values state: equity, safety, and culture are of the utmost importance. However, our current practices around language access fall short, particularly when it comes to the Deaf community's needs. Public meetings and events hosted by the City should automatically include ASL interpretation without prior request, just as Spanish interpretation is often provided without prior request for our residents. This ensures equitable access for more members of our community, especially when vital information about our city is being discussed. By excluding ASL interpretation to include the Deaf community, we're not only compromising the safety and inclusion of our Deaf and Hard of Hearing residents (who equate approximately 8% of our population), but are also missing out on the opportunity to celebrate the richness of Deaf culture in our community.</p>	<p>This is outside the scope of the CMP but is noted. City Staff have received this comment.</p>
Email	General Comment	<p>Please do not forget the wildlife in and around the city Grand Rapids. If Grand Rapids Planning wants to squeeze them into parks, communicate it to the public. Has anyone brought up maintain Wildlife? Your benefit of growth is more income for the city I get it, the city prospers, the community prospers. Not just developers, the community. Please don't forget the Wildlife. How does changes impact Wildlife, because it will have an impact. People young and old enjoy the nature that surrounds our homes. Example, a beautiful hawk was hunting for food and found a piece of food only to carry off onto a pole. Both myself on my porch and neighbor who happen to be walking daughter in stroller with their dog noticed and we were struck on wonderful to see in front of us. I tell you that story because it is not just us older generation that appreciate the parks and wildlife. Thank you. I see many dead animals on freeways, roadways in state of Michigan and Grand Rapids, please do not forget. I believe as adults we are responsible for children and animals (domestic and wildlife).</p>	<p>Noted. Parks are not within the scope of the CMP. The Parks and Recreation Strategic Master Plan provides a road map for the long-term development and sustainability of our park system.</p>
Email	General Comment	<p>Great Neighborhoods - Meet needs of residents in all phases of life (plan verbiage). It mentions "repurpose vacant, under-utilized sites" yet I don't see anything in the DRAFT Master Plan that addresses this vision for NECAA. Business Districts - pedestrian friendly, walkable, sense of community (plan verbiage). It talks about retail, civic, health, daycare, parks, plazas, senior centers that are walkable and inclusive. Corridor improvements districts, arts or cultural center, placemaking. Note page 58 map is blank for NECAA. Where is a "plan" for this area? NECAA has minimal if any of these items designated on DRAFT plan. Why doesn't NECAA have a corridor improvement plan for Leonard NE? Economy - encourages a prosperous quality of life (plan verbiage). No access to restaurants, internet cafes, innovation or artisan district. How can we attract/retain these types of businesses when nothing is designated on the DRAFT plan?. Page 64 map is blank for NECAA. Balanced Mobility - connected affordable, inclusive modes of transport. NECAA has no connected bike lanes, little if any rideshare or scooter access, no EV charging, etc. We have a need for additional enhanced cross-walks on Leonard. Where are these concerns addressed on Master Plan for NE Grand Rapids? Development Character - quality of life nodes - page 93 map. This section should include mixed uses, connecting neighborhoods to shopping, work areas, etc. It includes less auto-centric modes of transport, recreation, courtyards, restaurants, recreational facilities, etc. NECAA has none of these "life nodes". How can NECAA attract these types of businesses if there is no plan? I realize my interpretation is vague but it concerns me that NECAA/NE Grand Rapids appears to be gray or blank on most of the maps for future planning on the DRAFT Master Plan. How can we be sure our best interests, future growth, etc., are being addressed? How can NECAA qualify for a City-funded ASP? We have the new County Building coming to 196/Fuller (2026) and three large Corewell developments yet no place for employees or visitors to eat, shop or play? We appreciate the opportunity to meet with you and/or your office to better understand these concerns and how we are being represented. Thanks very much!</p>	<p>The CMP process does not address many of these topics for specific neighborhoods. However, an Area Specific Plan may be appropriate in the future. ASPs may be prepared for a block, a neighborhood, a business district or a larger area and are developed as a complement to the Master Plan. More information on this process can be found in Chapter 6.</p>

Email	General Comment	<p>In addition to the attached comments, I had a few general comments: Goals/Vision: I'm not convinced that the plan, as written, offers a compelling vision or goal for our City. Indeed, there are a lot of great threads throughout the document, but it falls short of setting some attainable and measurable objectives. Moreover, some of the language is quite weak or obtuse, allowing for a wide range of alternatives (on opposite sides of the spectrum). Ideally, I'd love to see this document commit to some stronger language and measurable goals to more clearly articulate the intended vision. Green Grand Rapids: It appears Green Grand Rapids is missing and/or wasn't included as part of the review process. What little is included in this plan tied to sustainability and environmental initiatives is weakly worded and lacking in imagination. Considering all of our City's sustainability initiatives, urban forestry, parks and recreation, transportation issues, etc. I'm dismayed that findings in Green Grand Rapids were not more fully incorporated into this plan. Indeed, Green Grand Rapids wasn't even reviewed during the plan scoping process - despite being an amendment to the City's 2002 master plan... and it shows. I think this plan takes it for granted that a number of sustainability and environmental initiatives are inherent to City programs. Yet, this is the master plan and it needs to set some better guidance and/or more directly incorporate findings and objectives from other plans (green grand rapids, parks master plan, etc.). Density: One of the bright spots in this plan is a commitment to increasing density. I appreciate that the plan listened to a wide range of stakeholders supporting increased density and expanding options to improve housing access and affordability. Glossary: There's a number of terms that are defined, yet not used at all in the document. This deserves a double-check. Historic Districts: While Historic Districts are not at all mentioned in the document, I think it needs to be acknowledged the impact historic district regulations have on affordability (or lack thereof). Our City should carefully evaluate its existing districts (and possible future districts) and think about the purpose of a historic district, how it aligns with our community objectives, and whether each district still makes sense in the context of our master plan. I'm not saying we need more historic districts, I'm not saying we need less, but I do think they deserve a hard look as we continue to consider density, affordability, and the future of our community. The plan says nothing about this. Weak Language: I note lots of uses of "support", "promote", etc. tied to a number of objectives. These are pretty wishy-washy objective words. What does it mean to support? What does it mean to promote? If the City makes one Facebook post about tall commercial buildings in commercial districts (Rec. 2A.4) is that enough to say the City supported it? I think due to the weak language, it's really easy to view many objectives from multiple angles, some perhaps in competition with overarching goals and the City's vision. Tighter language would make it much easier to interpret the intent of the plan, defend the City in zoning/planning disputes, and better articulate what we're trying to accomplish, as a community.</p>	<p>The CMP is a long-term guiding document for the Planning Department, focused on land use. Specific metrics would be quickly outdated over the life of this plan. While the plan references other City plans/initiatives, it does not duplicate work that is being done through those documents. Green Grand Rapids was an amendment to the previous Master Plan. The tree canopy goal is specifically reflected in the CMP but many other initiatives are already implemented or reflected in City regulations (i.e., the Zoning Ordinance).</p>
Email	General Comment	<p>It should be noted that the Public Draft available on-line for review contains several sections (notably "Desirable Development Character" and "Implementation") that were not available for review during the public meetings. Indeed, as of today the implementation section is labeled as "to be updated prior to adoption." We feel that these important sections did not receive the same level of public attention and review as the "Goal Areas" discussed widely at the public review meetings. As this extensive process draws to a close, we have the following additional comments: The proposed plan contains many aspirational goals and new initiatives. There needs to be a well-outlined action plan with quantifiable measures of success, adequate people and resources assigned, and benchmarks established. Attached to this letter is an example of benchmarking measures that would improve accountability and quantify success. As noted above, the Public Draft contains a section on Implementation that was not available earlier and is still incomplete as published. It appears that this section will use "value threads" to establish priorities, but it is unclear how these values will be used to set priorities. How should equity be compared to vibrancy and who will be setting these priorities? Most importantly, what are the benchmarks by which success can be recognized? Great Neighborhoods. One of the "tools" that has proven to be successful in revitalizing neighborhoods in Grand Rapids is historic preservation. This is shown not just in Heritage Hill, but in Cherry Hill, Fairmont Square, Wealthy Street and Heartside. Interestingly, the terms "historic district", "historic preservation", and "historic resources" are defined in the Glossary of the Public Draft but are never mentioned in the recommendations. We hope that this omission does not represent a lack of commitment to historic preservation by the City of Grand Rapids. Further, we feel that historic preservation can play a vital role in maintaining the unique character and local identity of neighborhoods, which is vital to neighborhood stability. Vital Business Districts. P36 – second bullet. "There is support for reduced parking in business districts." This is an overly broad generalization. The most vibrant business districts contain destination businesses that rely on customers arriving from throughout the metro area. We love living in our walkable neighborhood and being able to walk to local businesses. But neighborhood businesses in Grand Rapids cannot survive on pedestrian activity alone and require a balanced approach of public and private parking to remain sustainable. Asking for a reduction in parking is a different question than reducing or eliminating parking requirements. Also, efficient use of shared parking, public parking, and on-street parking all contribute to the success of a business district. These strategies lead to opportunities to redevelop underutilized parking facilities, thereby increasing density in a manner consistent with the overall goals of the plan. It is also noted that on-street parking plays a vital role in the success of our higher density residential areas.</p>	<p>The implementation chapter is intended to organize the work of City staff and their partners. The matrix was reviewed with City departments during the public comment period to ensure responsible groups were aware of and prepared for the implications of each recommendation.</p>
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	<p>I think it is a good idea to support more one bedroom and studio apartments, however, I would like to comment that building studio and one bedroom units is not always "less expensive" due to having fewer bedrooms. The rent generated by smaller units can be much less in comparison to 2 bedroom which means less funds to repay financing or cover operating costs.</p>	<p>Noted. The plan aims to support a wide range of housing options, with the understanding that there are other market factors that influence affordability.</p>
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	<p>Since you are highlighting Red-lining, which I agree is very important to be documented in the plan, could you also add the fact that deed restrictions can be found in neighborhoods where it literally states that the house cannot be sold to certain people (Jewish, Black, etc.) I have seen this myself on title work for a house on the SE side. The words were crossed out but it shows the legacy of housing discrimination that has affected our city.</p>	<p>Noted. Deed restrictions are outside the scope of the Planning Department and therefore the CMP.</p>
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	<p>Thank you for the focus on supporting affordable housing for mix of incomes, anti-displacement, and use of publicly owned land for affordable housing. Very important to take the lead as a City to influence the housing supply.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	<p>Vagueness of certain recommendations leads to community concerns about implementation, accountability and prioritization. For example developing an anti-displacement strategy has had added language and examples given to provide context but the recommendation is still at its base more planning. We need to move beyond planning into action. How will this plan be developed, by whom, what stakeholders will be involved and what is the timeline. I recognize this primarily becomes an implementation question which again shows the need for the implementation chapter to be released and available for community review.</p>	<p>The CMP process did not reach the level of engagement needed to develop an effective anti-displacement strategy. However, public comment elevated this as a need. It is therefore recommended for further action.</p>
Online	General Comment	<p>How will funding be distributed for implementation? Need investment (funding and resources) in Neighborhoods specifically for households of color when claiming to have an equity lens. Racial equity should be at the front of those discussions and decisions.</p>	<p>Funding will be determined by the responsible departments through standard budgeting and operational planning processes.</p>
Online	General Comment	<p>I have questions about implementation. Eager to see that chapter get finished and am disappointed it hasn't been updated before public comment period is over, something I've expressed to staff in the past. Regardless my suggestion is link the master plan to the commission's annual budget discussions. So, every year, they can look at how money was spent to implement the plan and allocate funding for the next fiscal year. Ideally, that could help show the areas of the plan the city is prioritizing to give commissioners and community a better understanding of how it is being implemented.</p>	<p>An implementation cycle diagram is included in that chapter to show the link between budgeting and review of the CMP.</p>
Online	(2) Vital Business Districts	<p>2C.2" Increase the capacity of the City's Corridor Improvement Authorities (CIA) to have meaningful impact in their districts." I strongly support this strategy.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Online	General Comment	<p>The Implementation section is key - I support putting the plan at the forefront when annual work programs and budgets are developed, development decisions, capital plan etc. all areas - also having an accountability mechanism to show the CMP is being taken into account. Without budget alignment, implementation will be difficult.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Online	General Comment	<p>Would like to see the Implementation Plan get fleshed out with the 1-5 year goals that will be tracked so the 5 year updates will be possible. Dedicated City staff person to guide Bridge toward the Future would be helpful!</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Online	(1) Great Neighborhoods	<p>The definition of complete neighborhoods needs to explicitly include retail space. Having neighborhood grocery stores, bakeries, bars is important for residents. These should be in corner stores, accessory commercial units, and live/work units. This allows residents to walk and bike to their daily needs, instead of driving. 1.A.2 - The "character" of a neighborhood should not be driven by city departments. Character is something that is developed naturally. Additionally, this layer of bureaucracy will only slow down development. It is a barrier that we cannot afford right now. 1.B.1 - The city should seek to acquire land along transit corridors and develop good public housing (see Montgomery County's Hillandale Gateway project). This housing should be mixed-income high quality. This has the upside of not relying on private developers or declining federal incentives. 1.B.2 - I am in support of allowing duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes, and ADUs by-right in single family zoned areas. Existing setbacks should be reconsidered to help allow this infill. 1.B.4 - Setbacks decrease the buildable space of a lot and therefore inhibit more dense housing development. I do not feel that setbacks are worth having, even for single family homes. I would trade my front yard for more backyard space any day. 1.C.5 - It is critical for a complete neighborhood to have a grocery store in walking distance. We should allow for grocery stores and markets by-right in single family zoned areas. Other thoughts: - There is no discussion of neighborhood integration with transportation networks. - Parking mandates should be ended. - Great neighborhoods need modern amenities. With so many work from home folks now, there should be a recommendation to create municipal fib</p>	Noted.
Online	(4) Balanced Mobility	<p>Balance is too subjective of a word. If we are serious about making our city safe and livable, a place made for actual humans, and reducing climate change then our mobility planning needs to focus on bus, bike, and foot transit. A proper city should have no need for personal automobiles. A lot of this section describes a plan to make a plan. Grand Rapids has done so much planning to make a plan, we should just stop. There are other cities (even outside of the USA) that know how to make and execute plans. We should simply copy and paste their plans. It will save time and money. And we can see in the present how the plans have worked for them. Why are we trying to reinvent the wheel? 4.A - Safe streets for all users means that auto traffic is physically separated from bicycle traffic. Without a network of physically separated bike lanes, there will always be unacceptable risk. The city needs to take steps to shift priorities from automobile accommodation to bicycle and foot traffic. 4.B.1 - Physically separated bike lanes are absolutely necessary for bike riders of all abilities to feel comfortable riding. The investment must come before increased ridership. Ridership will never increase without the infrastructure to make it safe and comfortable. Street parking is another impediment to a good bicycle network and responsible use of public land. This section gives too much leeway to groups who will only ask for more and cheaper parking. 4.B.2 - If the city wants to continue with partnering with 3rd parties to provide bicycle/scooter share programs, then it must ensure that it is affordable for everyone. I recently took a scooter ride across town that was the same cost as an Uber. Far too much to do on a regular basis. 4.C.1 - We don't need to reduce parking minimums. We need to Eliminate them. Let the market decide how much parking is actually worth. I suspect it is much less than what it costs the city. 4.C.2 - No more surface parking lots. It is a terrible use of our city's most precious resource, its land. Surface lots have low taxable value. They are a blight on the cityscape. They reduce density and therefore reduce amenity richness. They retain heat and make surrounding areas warmer. They encourage personal automobile use.</p>	Noted. The Planning Department does not have control over roadway design. The plan is intended to guide priorities and coordination.