

Manchester Community Joint Planning Commission Training
Citizen Planner Grant
Saturday October 27, 2007
Village of Manchester Hall: Community Room
8:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

In attendance:

Manchester Community Joint Planning Commission (MCJPC) Members:

Ron Mann, Manchester Township/Elected	Larry Lindemann, Freedom Township/PC
Jeff Wallace, Village of Manchester/PC	George Daubner, Manchester Township/PC
Robert Little, Freedom Township/Elected	Amy Riley, Bridgewater Township/Elected
Sybil Kolon, Manchester Township/PC	Marty Way, Village of Manchester/Elected
Peter Deloof, Freedom Township/PC	Deena McIntosh, Manchester Township/PC
Jolea Mull, Bridgewater Township/Elected	Gina Lentz, Village of Manchester/PC

MCJPC Members Absent (and sent notification of inability to attend):

Pat Vaillencourt, Village of Manchester/Elected
Chris Brown, Bridgewater Township/PC
Jennifer Alexa, Freedom Township/Elected

Staff Present:

Mark Roby, Washtenaw County Department of Planning & Environment
John Enos, Carlisle-Wortman Associates
Paul Siersma, Carlisle-Wortman Associates

Guest/Observer:

Nina David, Ph.D. candidate at University of Michigan School of Architecture and Urban Planning

Summary of Training Session:

Note: Training session discussion resulted in some departure from the printed agenda, although all areas of the agenda were covered.

1. The background and history of the Southwest Washtenaw Council of Governments (SWWCOG) was discussed. Some members of the MCJPC have participated in SWWCOG for many years, while some others know little about it. The evolution from informal group of township supervisors who were also members of the Optimists club, to the Southwest Washtenaw Council of Governments to the Manchester Community Joint Planning Commission was reviewed for the benefit of people unfamiliar with its history

Handout #1(2003 Plan goals, etc.) was distributed. The overall objectives, plan goals and implementation steps from the 2003 Regional Plan, as well as the goals from the 2006/07 LIAA

grant, were distributed and discussed. In addition, the May 2003 SWWCOG resolution was reviewed. Participants, by consensus, agreed that the objectives and goals were still relevant and should be retained as guides to creating the joint plan.

Specific land use goals from the 2003 plan that were compiled by Land Information Access Association (LIAA) staff were also distributed for later reference.

Participants and staff discussed the various considerations that have gone into discussions that eventually led to creation of the joint planning commission.

CWA staff discussed PA 226 of 2003, the Joint Municipal Planning Act, with respect to the legal basis and powers and duties of the Joint Planning Commission.

2. A Scoping Exercise was conducted to define the eventual purpose of the Manchester Community Joint Master Plan. Handout #2, "Community Discussion of Issues: Community Character and Features" Appendix II from the 2003 was distributed, as was the report from the "Manchester Township Community Survey, October 2006." Both are intended to provide recent examples of citizen comments about what are the most significant planning and governance issues of the day from the perspective of average citizens.

Participants reflected that most of the goals of the 2003 remain relevant and are worth including in the joint master plan. Specific goal statements are deferred until that part of development of the plan is scheduled in early 2008.

After some discussion participants suggested that Roby, Enos, Siersma and Mull use the 2003 Regional Plan Overall Objectives (on handout #1) to draw from as the basis for an updated Vision Statement for the MCJPC to use to guide the joint master plan. This will be done via email exchange and then discussed at the November 14 JPC meeting

Elements for Joint Master Plan:

The document work plan contained in JPC members' notebooks was used as a template for identification of appropriate elements to be included in the joint master plan. The Characteristics of the Community," "Community Goals, Objectives and Policies (GOPs)," and "Future Land Use" sections were reviewed and discussed. In general, participants agreed with the majority of elements in the document work plan. Additions/modifications to these sections include:

Characteristics of the Community:

- A fuller discussion of the changing nature of the Manchester area i.e. to what extent is it a small town, rural area where people work near where they live, and to what extent has it become a bedroom community from which people leave during the day (primarily) to commute to jobs in Ann Arbor, Jackson and elsewhere is to be added in the "Community Character" section.
- Descriptions of the Hamlet of Bridgewater and the minor civil division known as Fredonia are to be added to the "Employment and Regional Economy section.

- Use of the term “urban” is not desirable for this joint plan; participants and planners are asked to consider a more appropriate and accurate alternative term.
- “‘Urban’ Services District” and “‘Urban’ Growth boundary” are too similar in intended meaning and only one term (also replacing the term, “urban”) will be used in the drafts and final document.

Goals, Objectives and Policies (GOP’s)

- Discussion of “Rural Character” is to be in a separate section early in the GOP’s part of the plan and not within the “Agriculture” section of the GOP’s.
- Discussion of “Major traffic corridors” needs to include references to rural character e.g. gateways into the village, use of buffering and landscaping to preserve a “rural feel” while driving on major corridors.
- “Design Standards” and “Development Standards” need to be added to the GOP’s section.

Future Land Use

- The terms “Urban” and “Suburban” in describing various housing types need to be replaced.
- A “Mixed Use” category will be added to the list of future land uses.
- The “Commercial Districts” discussion needs to be expanded to include Bridgewater Hamlet and Fredonia.
- A “Transition Area” or “Blended” land use type is to be added to the list of future land uses.

Implementation

- The “Coordination with Nearby Jurisdictions” discussion will be moved from the Implementation section to the “Community Character” discussion.

Other Discussion:

- Chairperson Mull raised three ideas for the JPC to consider:
 1. Having regular, periodic half day sessions, perhaps on Saturdays, in order to have an extended time to discuss various plan-related issues in greater detail.
 2. Holding regular monthly meetings on a different day than the SWWCOG meetings.
 3. Forming subcommittees that can address complex aspects of the joint master plan in greater depth.

3. John Enos provided an overview of **key land use planning tools**. The handout provided covers the following items:

- The purpose and components of a comprehensive or master plan.
- The planning process.
- Identification and exploration of major issues.
- Goal setting, goal writing and establishing action steps.

- Future land use planning based on community character, adaptability of the land, community needs, available services and existing development.

Specific planning tools discussed include:

- Urban Growth Boundaries; right-sizing, phasing expansion, growth pressures, potential for deflection and fiscal strength.
- Historic Districts; preservation of historically significant buildings & structures, federal standards for historic preservation, tax credits & incentives.
- Agricultural Preservation strategies; PA 116, TDR, PDR and Right to Farm Act.
- Open space Preservation strategies; conservation easements, cluster development, natural features setbacks, woodland protection ordinances.
- Shared services; police/fire departments, city/village/township halls, parks & recreation, utilities.
- Form-based zoning; emphasize appearance/de-emphasize density and use regulations, defined around districts, neighborhoods and corridors, emphasize mixed uses/housing types, greater attention to streetscape, design focused public participation.
- Conditional rezoning; (Use With Caution), “certain use and development,” “offers” made to restrict use/development, voluntary agreements, time periods with extensions/reversion to previous zoning.
- Site Plan Review; zoning ordinance requirements, uses/activities requiring site plan approval, standards for decisions, application and review process, approving body or official.
- Review Standards; site design, drainage, natural areas, privacy, emergency access, public services, building arrangements, vehicle and pedestrian movement.
- Planned Unit Development (PUD); Types: residential, commercial, industrial, mixed use and TND/special
- Special PUDs; open space development, industrial parks, transfer of development rights, farmland/open space preservation
- PUD approval methods; mapped zoning district, floating zone district, special land use.
- Public participation/Getting the public involved; public hearings (required), visioning, focus groups, workshops/town meetings, design charrettes, civic group presentations, media, community surveys and personal interviews.

4. **Joint planning “lessons learned”** from other communities, based on a recent report from LIAA, were reviewed. Lessons learned include:

- Cities, villages and townships are fundamentally different
- Each community has a unique history that must be respected
- Cooperation works better when municipalities know what they want
- The degree and type of cooperation must be tailored to the community
- Formal and informal interaction lays the groundwork for cooperative planning
- Be realistic: progress at first is incremental
- The affected public must understand the benefits and be involved

The article, “Cooperative Land Use Planning with the Joint Municipal Planning Act,” by Joe VanderMeulen, Executive Director of LIAA, was distributed for reading at home.

5. The **Citizen Participation** part of the agenda was covered during the presentation of Key Planning Tools.

Attachments:

- Agenda
- Handouts:
 1. SWWCOG overall objectives and regional plan goals, LIAA goals, SWWCOG resolution, specific land use goals from 2003 plan
 2. Community Discussion of Issues (from 2000 and 2003)
 3. Manchester Township Community Survey (2006)
 4. Regional Planning Lessons Learned
 5. VanderMeulen article
 6. Michigan Land Use Institute article, “As Sprawl Looms, Wary Townships Try Joint Planning” (September 24, 2007)
 7. PowerPoint slides: Comprehensive Planning from Carlisle-Wortman presentation to Michigan Association of Planning