



WASHTENAW COUNTY OFFICE OF STRATEGIC PLANNING

To: Manchester Community Joint Planning Commission
From: Melissa Milton-Pung
Re: Donald Pennington/William De Groot Memorandum dated April 22
Date: April 30, 2009

Attached is a memorandum, dated April 22, 2009, from Freedom Township's Planning Consultants concerning the draft Manchester Community Joint Master Plan. This thorough report indicates the township's ongoing involvement and commitment in the drafting of the master plan document. The following text is staff's review and responses to these comments for your discussion at the May 13 meeting.

Plan Implementation Section

2.01 Development Focus

MCJMP Text: **Two other areas have concentrated development, or are potentially influenced by other jurisdiction's presence, but which are not proposed for growth at this time. These areas are the Pleasant Lake area and the area north of the Village of Clinton within Washtenaw County/Bridgewater Township. (Page XX)**

De Groot Comment: "This paragraph should be added to the following paragraph in order to ensure the right message is being presented. In both areas (Pleasant Lake, and Clinton) a "sub area plan" exists to control the density based on sound planning as described in the paragraph that ends sub-section (b)."

Staff Response: While agreeing with the point made about the importance of sub area plans, adding this paragraph to the succeeding one is not recommended. The distinction between Growth Transitions Areas (first paragraph), non growth areas (second paragraph), and the use of sub area plans for both types of areas (third paragraph) is clearer.

2.02 Manchester Village GTA

MCJMP Text: **Commercial development should occur in planned shopping center configurations in a coordinated manner with controlled access, consolidated parking, extensive landscaping, pedestrian access and alternative transportation accommodations. (Page XX)**

De Groot Comment: "The character of the commercial section was to limit the ideal of strip malls or shopping centers on every corner. This statement should be consistent with the intent of the Commercial Section. Please read the Goals of the Commercial Section:

Goal 4: Develop and maintain commercial areas that integrate aesthetically and functionally into the surrounding land use networks.

Goal 5: Prevent strip development by creating planned, compact commercial centers that fit in with the character of existing development.

Staff Response: Agreed. If the MCJPC wishes, the following revision is suggested: **“Commercial development should occur in planned compact configurations compatible with existing development with controlled access.... .”**

2.03 Comparison of Growth Areas

MCJMP Text: **Objective – Pleasant lake District – Redevelopment without growth; Lake Preservation. (Page 6/30)**

De Groot Comment: “The statement of ‘Redevelopment without growth’ should be restated as ‘focused infill development and redevelopment to encourage Lake Preservation’ ”.

Staff Response: Agreed. If the JPC wishes, the text in the table cell (under Objective) may be changed to read: **“Focused Infill to Encourage Lake Preservation.”**

2.04 Infrastructure

A. MCJMP Text: **An ‘adequate facilities plan’ will be prepared for each Growth Transition Area to determine the extent of future development, if any, that can be supported by public services. (Page 7/30)**

De Groot Comment: “The use of ‘adequate’ needs to be corrected because this is an arbitrary word that can be exploited by a developer or engineer instead of the use of proper planning techniques. Additionally, what is the purpose of “each Growth Transition Area”? Per the plan there is only one GTA and then sub area plans that are Township Centers for the purpose of serving township residents not a region as described for the GTA.”

Staff Response: No change suggested. The term “adequate facilities plan” is commonly used to refer to an infrastructure (utilities) capacity and land use study which in itself is as simple or complex as the jurisdiction wishes. The intent is to highlight and plan for these unique higher intensity areas. For the foreseeable future, only the Manchester GTA and a potential Bridgewater Hamlet GTA should have a facilities plan. That may change in the future. The other two “subareas” are not considered GTAs and do not require a facilities plan.

B. MCJMP Text: **Extensions of water and sewer lines to new development will be the responsibility of the developer and such facilities will be constructed to the municipality’s standards. (Page 7/30)**

De Groot Comment: “The importance of this statement is that each community should or would have to develop Land Development Standards. These standards would list the applicable construction methods in which “such facilities” shall be developed. Most communities within the region do not have such standards.”

Staff Response: If the JPC wishes, the statement may be changed to read: **“...and such facilities will be constructed to acceptable professional engineering standards”.**

C. MCJMP Text: **In the event that no municipality can provide services, the development may be deferred until such time that a financial plan is approved, with the cooperation of the Manchester Community Joint Master Plan members.**

De Groot Comment: “A financial plan is not the only planning tool when considering if a ‘municipality can provide services’, and additionally it normally is not more important than character or environmental concerns. This sentence should be eliminated because it does not add to the section.”

Staff Response: Within the context of the “Infrastructure” section, the approval of a utilities financial plan for providing services to a proposed development seems appropriate. Rather than eliminate the sentence, it is suggested that it be revised to read: **“...with the cooperation of the Manchester Community Joint Master Plan members to ensure that all other requirements of the Joint Master Plan are addressed by the development”**

D. MCJMP Text: **Package Waste Treatment Systems will not be allowed within the Growth Transitions Areas. Public water services may be extended beyond the GTA to existing development for emergency needs. (Page 7/30)**

De Groot Comment: “ In many rural community master plans a “Package Waste Treatment System” is not allowed because of environmental assessment restrictions. If the intent is to regulate these systems to prevent them to be constructed an areas where public infrastructure exists, than a prohibition should be explored.”

Staff Response: That is the intent. At the March meeting the MCJPC deleted the sentence in this paragraph which prohibited package treatment systems in areas outside of GTA areas. No change is suggested.

2.06 Annexations

A. MCJMP Text: **Under certain circumstances the Village.....(Page 9/30)**

De Groot Comment: “This section should be reviewed by each community’s general council for appropriate wording and planning accuracy.”

Staff Response: That request will be passed on each jurisdiction’s Board when the MCJPC completes its review and submits the Master Plan for adoption.

2.07 Work Program

A. MCJMP Text: **The following charts indicate the Goal-Objective listed in each of the Master Plan chapters. (Page 21/30)**

De Groot Comment: “Does this section have to be in the Plan? If this plan is to meet the goal of the State Planning Acts then this section may not be needed because only few objectives will extend multiple years beyond the local changes needed to meet the MCJCP Master Plan. Furthermore, at the

end of each section there are goals and objectives assigned, so this section maybe redundant, but it is nice to have in a centralized location This table might be served by reference in each section and eliminate the goals and objectives section in the body of each section. “

Staff Response: The dual charts are redundant and somewhat excessive since the objectives are listed in each section. The principal reason for this section is to portray the vast number of objectives for the MCJPC to consider and to suggest a format for undertaking the highest priority goals. If the JPC wishes, this section may be shortened.

3.01 Future Land Use

MCJMP Text: The Master Land Use Plan is graphically illustrated. Future land use designations are made for the Planning Area. The following descriptions are intended to provide a brief overview of the designation's intended character and relate each to the member communities' current Master Plan. Table _ at the end of this section is intended to identify how the future land use categories relate to the zoning districts of communities within the planning area.

De Groot Comment: “This paragraph should be improved to make it clear that these are the current land use categories that are shared by the MCJPC. These categories may be the basis for a future land use map but constitute community land use patterns throughout the planning regions in order to show the regions shared planning practice.”

Staff Response: Agreed. If the JPC wishes, the opening paragraph of this section may be revised to read: **The Master Land Use Plan ~~is~~ graphically illustrated~~ed~~. Future land use designations ~~are made~~ for the Planning Area. ~~These land use categories are representative of the land use categories used by each of the MCJPC members.~~ The following descriptions are intended to provide a brief overview of the ~~land use category designation's~~ intended character and ~~to~~ relate each ~~category~~ to the members' current Master Plans. Table _ at the end of this section is intended to identify how the future land use categories relate to the zoning districts of ~~the member~~ communities within the planning area.**