



Washtenaw County
Office of Strategic Planning

1/20/2009 DRAFT UNTIL ADOPTED BY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Margaret O'Connor, Secretary
Lodi Township Planning Commission
3755 Pleasant Lake Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48108

Re: Lodi Township Master Plan Update Review

Dear Ms. O'Connor:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Lodi Township Master Plan (Township Plan) update. In accordance with the Michigan Planning Enabling Act, Public Act 33 of 2008, the Township Plan was reviewed by Washtenaw County Planning Advisory Board and the Board of Commissioners. The Washtenaw County Department of Parks and Recreation, Road Commission, Department of Public Health, Office of the Water Resources Commissioner and the Washtenaw Area Transportation Study (WATS) were also given the opportunity to comment on the update.

Worth commending is the designation of the two Municipal Services Areas, the designation and plan for Lodi Central, as well as including Agricultural Preservation plan elements. Establishing such limits on services, while providing strong protective measures for agricultural land and open space minimizes the negative impacts of development while increasing service efficiency. Language encouraging clustering of residential areas and utilizing density transfers also strengthen this goal. Such planning allows for the needs of existing and future residents to be met, while also addressing sustainable growth and natural resource protection.

Staff reviewed the proposed update in the context of A Comprehensive Plan for Washtenaw County (County Plan), plans of contiguous local units of government and the current Lodi Township Master Plan (Township Plan). Staff found the proposed amendments would be consistent with the County Plan and the plans for the contiguous communities with the following recommendations:

- **While the overall pattern for development described in the Township Plan corresponds to that recommended in the Comprehensive Plan for Washtenaw County, the Agriculture designation on Map 6 and described on page 51 in Section 6.10 and the Agricultural Zoning District described in Section 16.04 is set for a two (2) acres minimum lot size, while Figure 3-6: Recommended Potential Future Landscapes in the County Plan**

suggests this area to be a minimum lot size of five acres or greater (5+ acres) to be consistent. To meet the goals and objectives of the Landscapes, Agriculture, and Transportation chapters of the County Plan, the Township should consider a minimum lot size of 20 acres or greater for both the Agriculture designation on Map 6 and the Agriculture Zoning District, and/or other techniques that are supportive of the preservation of agricultural and open space.

Although the following recommendations are not applicable to the consistency with the County Plan, we strongly encourage the incorporation of the following to enhance the overall plan:

- The draft master plan has several typographical/grammatical errors, inconsistent map references, duplicate and non-sequential map numbering, and repetition of text. The Township should carefully edit the Master Plan document before adopting it.
- Map 6, found on pages 29 and 108 is titled "Master Plan." The Township should consider using the title "Future Land Use Map" as the title for this map, as the whole document is called "Master Plan." This suggested title would distinguish it from the title of the entire document. Additionally, the Michigan Planning Enabling Act (P.A. 33 of 2008) uses the terminology of "Future Land Use Map" throughout the act, and this suggested title would be consistent with the terminology used in this legislation.
- P.A. 33 requires an explanation in the zoning plan of how each of the land use categories on the future land use map relate to the districts on the zoning map. Within the zoning plan there is no clear identification of how some of the specific land use categories on Map 6 relate to each zoning district of the Township's zoning ordinance. Specifically, Rural Residential Districts and Commercial and Office Districts (Sections 16.04.B and 16.04.D). Some of the residential zoning districts' relationships with the Map 6 categories are found in Part 7 of the plan, but not located in the Zoning Plan (Part 16). The Township should consider making specific reference to the corresponding future land use map (Map 6) category to each of the Township's zoning districts in Part 16 – Zoning Plan.
- The incorporation of recommendations from the Washtenaw Area Transportation Study (WATS) Non-motorized Plan for Washtenaw County by reference (For specific information, see WATS and Public Health Comments attached)
- In Section 11.03A, the Township should consider using the National Functional Classification of Roads (For specific information See WATS Comments Attached)
- The Township should also consider incorporating the recommendations from the WATS Transit Plan for Washtenaw County that includes the provision of demand response/door to door service throughout the township (For specific information, see WATS Comments Attached)

- A major concept of the plan is the establishment of an interconnected natural features system, as well as pedestrian and bicycle linkages. Developing a regional greenway plan that combines a natural features inventory with a regional recreation trail network would satisfy multiple goals set by the Township Plan. This point is supported by Public Health and WATS.
- In order to support the Township's efforts to maintain its rural character and to use resources efficiently as development progresses, gravel road capacity should be considered. A study of gravel road capacities as a means to manage growth was prepared by the Huron River Watershed Council and can be found at http://www.hrwc.org/pdf/PAL_Guidebook.pdf.
- The Township Plan communicates a strong grasp of its unique character, giving reference to the history and character in various sections of the plan. Language regarding the importance of historic preservation to the community's character should be more strongly articulated in the final draft. Lodi Township should consider the addition of a goal to seek protection and preservation of historic resources through local, state and national programs.
- Another major concept of this plan is the designation of two Municipal Service Areas. However, there isn't much detailed site planning guidelines on the two designated Municipal Services Areas, other than Section 7.04 and sections of Part 12. The Township should consider adding more site planning guidelines for both of these two Municipal Services Areas, either by expanding Part 8 – Special Use Areas or devoting a new Part devoted as a Special Area Plan for both Municipal Services Areas.
- Designating lands for agricultural preservation through an overlay and stating "these lands should not be considered land banks for future rural or urban development or as low density residential areas" is a strong aspect of this plan. In addition, the amendments to the Township Plan could make Lodi Township eligible for additional points from the State of Michigan PDR Program. The comments found within this review reveal that the Lodi Township Master Plan meets 4 of the 5 necessary requirements to be eligible for the additional points from the State of Michigan PDR Program. However, in order to be eligible for additional points from the State of Michigan PDR Program, the Township Master Plan must meet all 5 requirements. Specific requirements and suggestions are included in more detail in the Staff Review and Statement of Consistency with MAPF (State PDR Program) section. The opportunity for and importance of agricultural preservation is also supported by Washtenaw County Public Health comments.
- The Township should also consider aligning the "Agriculture" Master Plan Map designation, as well as a "Lands Designated for Agricultural Preservation Overlay Area" designation with parcel lines, especially in Sections 4, 5, 6 and 23.
- Three of the townships that border Lodi Township (Freedom Township, Saline Township, and Scio Township) have adopted and implemented

Sliding Scale requirements for their respective Agricultural Zoning Districts. The Township should consider including the sliding scale agricultural zoning requirements as a policy and/or strategy in Part 6 Agricultural Land Use of the Master Plan to help contribute to a critical mass of agricultural land in Lodi Township and bordering townships and adopt and implement within the Township's zoning ordinance.

- Agricultural preservation is addressed as an objective within the plan. An important part of maintaining the viability of the agricultural sector is the viability of the local and regional agricultural economy. Lodi Township should consider adding a goal, or an objective, or a policy that supports and/or endorses the five-county Southeast Michigan Food System Economic Partnership (FSEP) to help support agricultural producers in the Township and the region as well as encourage new agricultural and food system economic opportunities. The FSEP website can be found at <http://www.fsepmichigan.org> for more information on the program. This point is supported by Washtenaw County Public Health.

The attached staff report provides additional detail and background regarding County comments. Additionally, agency comments are provided containing additional detailed recommendations and should be reviewed and considered. On behalf of the Planning Advisory Board and the Board of County Commissioners, I would like to thank you for your contribution to promoting a shared vision for Washtenaw County.

If the Department may be of assistance to the Township as you work to implement the policies included in your plan, please call me at (734) 222-6888.

Sincerely,

Patricia Denig, Director of Community Planning
Office of Strategic Planning
Washtenaw County

Attachments

Staff Report

Washtenaw County Department of Public Health comments

Washtenaw Area Transportation Study (WATS) comments

Cc: City of Ann Arbor Clerk
Ann Arbor Charter Township Clerk
Bridgewater Township Clerk
Freedom Township Clerk
Lima Township Clerk
Pittsfield Charter Township Clerk

City of Saline Clerk
Saline Township Clerk
Scio Township Clerk
Don Pennington, Lodi Twp Planning
Consultant



Washtenaw County Office of Strategic Planning

Staff Report

RE: Lodi Township Master Plan Review – Washtenaw County Review

Staff Report Date: 1/20/2009

Background

The Washtenaw County Office of Strategic Planning received the draft Lodi Township Master Plan (Township Plan) on December 10, 2008. In accordance with the Michigan Planning Enabling Act, Public Act 33 of 2008, the County is to provide comments to the Township, which must include two statements of consistency:

- A statement as to whether, after considering any comments received by contiguous local units of government, the proposed update is consistent with the plan of contiguous communities, and;
- A statement as to whether the proposed update is consistent with the County Plan.

The proposed update was reviewed for consistency with *A Comprehensive Plan for Washtenaw County* (County Plan). The Washtenaw County Department of Development Services, Department of Parks and Recreation, Road Commission, Department of Public Health, Office of the Water Resources Commissioner and the Washtenaw Area Transportation Study (WATS) were also given the opportunity to comment on the document.

Summary of Update/Review in context of County Plan

Although Lodi Township will not meet the State PDR Requirements as the Master Plan is currently drafted unless it includes a Master Plan Overlay Map or Designation on the Master Plan Map that identifies an area for "Agricultural Preservation," the Master Plan update draft does meet 4 of the 5 requirements of the State PDR Program and if it includes the "Lands Designated for Agricultural Preservation Overlay Map" or a "Lands Designated for Agricultural Preservation designation on the Master Plan Map (Map 6) it will meet all 5 requirements of the State PDR Program incomplete sentence (See the Statement of Consistency with MAPF below). Designating lands for agricultural preservation through an overlay or designation and stating "these lands should not be considered land banks for future rural or urban development or as low density residential areas" is a strong aspect of this plan. Such an overlay or designation could act as a buffer between more developed areas (e.g. the Cities of Ann Arbor and Saline, Pittsfield Township, and Scio Township and more distant communities of Chelsea, Dexter, Manchester, Clinton, and Tecumseh. [Consistent with County Plan's

Landscape Recommendation 4.2, Buffers: Encourage local governments of urban, suburban, smaller cities and villages and the areas surrounding them to incorporate open space buffers around their communities in their master plans. Buffers are to be part of their open space plan].

The Master Plan Update could make Lodi Township eligible for additional points from the State of Michigan PDR Program, provided that the “Lands Designated for Agricultural Preservation Overlay Area” is identified on a map. Specific requirements under the *Michigan Agricultural Preservation Fund (MAPF) Policies and Procedures* to qualify for the State’s PDR Program are included in more detail later in this report.

Another strong aspect of this plan is the designation of two Municipal Services Areas as well as a plan for the newly named Lodi Central for the area near the intersection of Ann Arbor-Saline Road and Pleasant Lake Road. Both of these designations are identified in Part 3 – Basic Concepts of the Master Plan. The policies and guidelines for Lodi Central are outlined in Part 8 – Special Use Area – Lodi Central, and the policies and guidelines for the Municipal Services Areas are outlined in Part 7 – Residential Land Use, Section 7.04 Suburban Residential (R-3) General Guidelines and Part 12 – Public Services of the Plan. However, while the two Municipal Services Areas are identified in Part 7 and Part 12, incorporating more detailed policies that would identify the level of development and capacity needed, the timing of service and cost/revenue sharing arrangements, as well as other site and design guidelines similar to Part 8 – Special Use Area – Lodi Central would strengthen the intent of the municipal services areas they do not have [Consistent with County Plan’s Landscapes Recommendation 1.8 Small City and Village Infrastructure Planning, Sewer and Water Service Recommendation 1.4—Urban Service District Capacity, as well as Landscapes Recommendations 3.4 – Hamlet Plans].

Language on the importance of pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure is found throughout the plan. A non-motorized transportation system within and connecting commercial and residential land uses help to create a safe and enjoyable community for residents. The incorporation of the Washtenaw Area Transportation Study (WATS) Non-Motorized Plan for Washtenaw County by reference would strengthen this community goal.

A major concept of the plan is the establishment of an interconnected natural features system, as well as comprehensive pedestrian and bicycle linkages. Policies such as “encourage continuous open-space systems, centered around natural features, to enhance existing concentrations of development” demonstrate the Township’s awareness that non-motorized transportation, recreation and natural resources conservation can be coordinated to be mutually beneficial, as well as provide public health benefits to a community. Developing a regional greenway plan that combines a natural features inventory with a regional recreation trail would satisfy multiple goals set by the Township Master Plan. The Township should consider the inclusion of a

greenways and trails map and language addressing the designation and protection of greenways and non-motorized transportation.

A policy stated in the Plan is “access to new development shall be from existing paved roads wherever feasible” [Part 11 – Transportation, Section 11.03 C.3.d.]. Without proper planning, rural residential development can have a sprawling affect. This development and associated traffic can overburden gravel roads and threaten rural character as well as natural resources such as water quality. In order to support the Township’s efforts to maintain a rural character, as well as to use resources efficiently as development progresses, gravel road capacity should be considered. A gravel road capacity analysis can help to determine density limitations on gravel roads and will provide useful information for refining land use plans, reviewing development proposals, and prioritizing road projects in order to minimize the negative impacts of development along gravel roads. A study of gravel road capacities as a means to manage growth in rural and suburban communities was prepared by the Huron River Watershed Council and can be found at http://www.hrwc.org/pdf/PAL_Guidebook.pdf.

Historic resources are integrated components of Lodi Township’s existing building stock. They contribute to the community’s overall feeling and sense of place, and help define to the distinctive identity of this rural township’s residential and agricultural landscape. The Washtenaw County historic resources database on the web, known as HistWeb, returned 159 individual historic sites recorded within Lodi Township. Washtenaw County records also returned at least eleven (11) designated Centennial Farms, sites which have been owned by the same family for at least one hundred years. These sites are reminders of many Lodi Township families’ proud agricultural heritage.

The Lodi Township Master Plan update includes a thorough discussion of the area’s local history, but it omits specific mention of the importance of such historic resources association with Lodi Township history. Places of note, such as the Lodi Township Hall, the Lodi, Rosier, and Waters Road cemeteries, places of worship and various historic family farms, are deserving of provisions for their careful use, recognition, preservation, or rehabilitation. In the face of development pressures, if not now but in the future, it is clear that not every historic building, site, object, and structure can be preserved. Lodi Township would do well, however, to include language regarding the importance of historic preservation to the community’s character, particularly the value of rural/agricultural sites, traditional landscapes, and infill development standards congruent with the current form and rhythm of this rural community. Lodi Township should consider articulating a goal to seek protection and preservation of historic resources through local, state and national historic designation or easement programs, all of which employ design guidelines and review to insure appropriate treatment of historic properties (County Plan Historic Preservation: Chapter 9 Objective 3).

Washtenaw County Community Planning can provide assistance in regard to any of these plan areas.

Statement of Consistency with MAPF (State PDR Program)

Staff reviewed the amendments to the Lodi Township Master Plan for consistency with *A Comprehensive Plan for Washtenaw County* (County Plan) and the *Michigan Agricultural Preservation Fund Standards* (Standards):

- It is not known if the proposed Lands Designated for Agricultural Preservation Overlay area closely aligns with the Recommended Proposed Future Landscapes in the County Plan: Open Space and Rural (5+ acre lots), and the Washtenaw County Agricultural Overlay Area as there is no map that identifies this Overlay Area, although this area has been described in the draft Master Plan. This draft of the Master Plan does not meet Requirement number 1 of the State PDR requirements. (See number “1. Requirement” below). Lodi Township does meet State PDR Requirements 2 through 5.
- If all of these State PDR Requirements are met, the amendments could make Lodi Township eligible for additional points from the State of Michigan PDR Program. [Consistent with County Plan’s Agriculture Recommendation 2.1, Farmland Preservation Funding: Encourage landowners to apply for state and federal programs and encourage local governments to identify funding methods for farmland preservation including...PDR program].
- Below are the five master plan requirements under the *Michigan Agricultural Preservation Fund Policies and Procedures* to qualify for the State’s PDR Program. The Lodi Township Master Plan update draft meet four of the five following requirements of the State PDR Program with recommendations provided to meet Requirement number 1 and to more competitively position Lodi Township for the program.

1. Requirement: A New “Agricultural Preservation” Future Land Use Plan Category, Map Amendment

Discussion: In the definition section found on page 13, in Section 6.05 Agricultural Preservation, refer to a map and land use designation as “Lands Designated for Agricultural Preservation.” In Section 6.05 on page 49, the map is specifically referred to as “Map 6 – Master Plan – Agricultural – Lands Designated for Agricultural Preservation Overlay” and indicates that the map serves as an Overlay to “Map 6 – Lodi Township Master Plan.” On page 50, it states that “Map 6 – Lodi Township Master Plan” specifically identifies an overlay area of Lodi Township where there is the largest concentration of ongoing farmland activities.” The draft Master Plan document does not include a map called “Map 6 – Master Plan – Agricultural – Lands Designated for Agricultural Preservation Overlay” nor any such designation on “Map 6 – Lodi Township Master Plan.” The non-existence of the “Lands Designated for Agricultural Preservation Overlay,” either as its own separate map or a designation on the Master Plan Map, and the

duplication of the use of "Map 6" for two maps is confusing and not clear.

The text on page 49 does generally state that the "Lands Designated as Agricultural Preservation," are located in the central, western and southern portions of the Township. Either a separate map titled: "Agricultural – Lands Designated for Agricultural Preservation Overlay" with appropriate Map number (to distinguish it from Map 6 – Lodi Township Master Plan) or a specific designation with this same title should be included on Map 6 Master Plan Map to illustrate the specific location of this Overlay Area on a map in order to meet this State PDR Requirement. The title for this Overlay Area will work, as it must contain the words "Agricultural" or "Farmland" and "Preservation" according to the State PDR Requirements.

Additionally, if the boundaries of the "Agriculture" designation on Map 6 – Master Plan Map found on pages 29 and 108 are used as part of or entirely as the way of designating the "Lands Designated for Agricultural Preservation Overlay Area," the Township should consider changing the boundaries of this "Agriculture" designation, as well as the boundaries of the Lands Designated for Agricultural Preservation Overlay Area to be aligned with parcel lines. In 2006, Lodi Township property owners participated in the Washtenaw County Application to the State PDR Program (Michigan Agricultural Preservation Fund). There were property owners that applied to the program and parts of their respective properties were not eligible to the State PDR Program. This is particularly a problem with the "Agriculture" designation boundaries in Sections 4, 5, 6 and 23. Washtenaw County adopted a countywide Agricultural Preservation Overlay Area in 2006 to become eligible to the State PDR Program, and used the categories from each Township in the County that were the lowest density future land use category titled with "Agriculture" or "Agricultural Preservation" as the methodology for designating the countywide Agricultural Preservation Overlay Area. Because these properties contained part of their respective properties in Lodi Township's "Agriculture" designation, and the remaining parts in non-Agriculture land use categories, those remaining parts in these non-Agriculture areas were not a part of the Washtenaw County Agricultural Preservation Overlay Area and as a result were not eligible to the State PDR program.

2. Requirement: PDR and Other Agricultural Preservation Strategies (Policies) must be included in the Goals, Objectives, Policies Section of the Master Plan

Discussion: Text referring to the strategies intended to preserve agricultural land should include PDR, but also other techniques. Lodi Township's Master Plan contains within the "Agricultural Land Use Part" under Sections 6.09, 6.10 and 6.11 objectives, policies and strategies

which address farmland preservation. Among the strategies on 52 and 53 include:

- A. Encourage farmers to participate in PA 116.
- E. Actively encourage farmers in the Township to apply for PDR funds from the federal, state and/or county governments.
- F. Amend the Township Zoning Ordinance where necessary to incorporate the additional agricultural protection based on the policies of this plan.

Additionally, the designation of Municipal Services Districts within the Township is also an important strategy for directing growth away from agricultural areas in the Township. These objectives and strategies fit in very well with the state's PDR requirements, and these strategies also fit in with the Agriculture strategies found in Chapter 4 of *A Comprehensive Plan for Washtenaw County*.

3. Requirement: Include a paragraph describing why farmland should be preserved in Lodi Township.

Discussion: The text on pages 48-50 including Sections 6.01, 6.02, 6.03, 6.04, and 6.05 meet this requirement. In Section 6.05 in the beginning paragraph of the Agricultural Preservation section that meets this requirement quite well. The reasons include retaining the use of prime agricultural soils in recognition of the importance of the sustenance and economic benefits provided by the agricultural industry to the residents of Lodi Township.

4. Requirement: A paragraph describing why the new "Agricultural Preservation" future land use plan category, was chosen/designated.

Discussion: The third, fourth, fifth and sixth paragraphs of Section 6.05 Agricultural Preservation on pages 49 and 50 states reasons for its designation:

The Lands Designated for Agricultural Preservation are designated for the following reasons:

- A. Existing agricultural operations are the predominating land use within these areas.
- B. These areas are primarily comprised on prime agricultural soils according to the USDA-NRCS Washtenaw County Soil Survey
- C. There are numerous parcels larger than 40 that are contiguous to other large parcels in agricultural production.
- D. Other governmental studies and land use inventories recognize these areas including the 2000 Southeast Michigan Council of Governments land use inventory and the Agricultural Lands Map, 4-1 of the Washtenaw County adopted *A Comprehensive Plan for Washtenaw County*.

E. Several PA 116 contracts exist in the area.

The fourth paragraph of 6.05 indicates this designated area serves as Overlay to Map 6 – Lodi Township Master Plan. Additionally, the fifth paragraph identifies that the Overlay Area was selected in a manner to be non-exclusionary for potential interest by landowners in a PDR or other agricultural preservation options; areas that provide the most potential for on-going or new agriculture activities; recognizing that this Overlay Area are highly sought-after tracts for development; and to underscore continuity with adjoining communities which have also designated “agricultural preservation” goals. The sixth paragraph of this section also indicates that this Overlay Area where there is the largest concentration of ongoing farmland activities, highly productive soils, large tracts of land, and few non-agricultural uses.

While there is no “Lands Designated for Agricultural Preservation Overlay Map” contained within the plan, and there is a duplication of the labeling of “Map 6” with the Overlay Area and the “Lodi Township Master Plan Map, these reasons for selecting the Lands Designated for Agricultural Preservation Overlay Area do fit in very well with the state’s PDR requirements.

5. Requirement: Farmland preservation goal(s).

Discussion: The objective found under Section 6.09 on page 51 serves as the required farmland preservation goals. It states the following: “Continued encouragement must be given for the continuation of long-term agricultural activities within Lodi Township based on existing operations and physical soils considered highly productive for such use. This is encouraged due to the economic benefits provided by the agricultural industry to the residents of Lodi Township, and for the rural character and open space benefits it provides. The policies on page 51 and 52 also support this objective, as well as the Implementation Strategies found under Section 6.11 on pages 52 and 53.

Washtenaw County is well versed in the State PDR Program and would be a willing partner to assist the Township in implementing these recommendations.

Contiguous Community Land Uses

- East (Pittsfield Township): The western portion of Pittsfield Township includes land designated for Low Density Residential (1 d.u.’s per acre) to High Density Residential (9 d.u.’s per acre), Research and Development, Regional Commercial, and Private Recreation. Except for the area that surrounds the intersection of Maple and Textile

Roads, the area immediately east of Lodi Township in Pittsfield is served by Sanitary Sewer from YCUA.

- Southeast (City of Saline): Single-family residential with a density of 3 to 5 units per acre, with sewer and water service provided, as well as Professional Office, Multiple Family Residential, Public/Quasi-Public, Mixed-Use, Commercial, as well as Open Space – Recreation are designated in neighboring areas to Lodi Township within the City of Saline.
- South (Saline Township): Land Use designations along the border with Saline Township include mostly Agriculture uses, and Rural Residential and Manufactured Housing development in the northeast corner of the Township near the City of Saline.
- Southwest (Bridgewater Township): Agricultural designations exist generally in the northeast corner of the Township, however, nearest to its border at a point with Lodi Township is the Hamlet of Bridgewater which has public sewer and has Medium Density Residential designation and small areas designated for commercial and industrial uses.
- West (Freedom Township): Agricultural uses exist near the Township's boundary with Lodi Township.
- Northwest (Lima Township): Agricultural uses are predominant in Lima Township near its border at a point with Lodi Township.
- North (Scio Township): Open Space, Agricultural, Rural Residential, Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, High Density Residential, Recreation and Conservation, Office and Industrial, Commercial and Public-Semi Public are the uses that are near Scio Township's boundary with Lodi Township. Sewer Service is available along a contiguous corridor along Jackson Road which. This sewer service corridor includes sewer service located in Section 36 of Scio Township, adjacent to Section 1 of Lodi Township near the intersection of Wagner and Scio Church Roads.
- Northeast (City of Ann Arbor and small jurisdictional islands of Ann Arbor Township): Single-Family Residential, Multi-Family Residential, Commercial, Office, Public-Quasi Public and Parks and Recreation are the land use categories in Ann Arbor City's (including small jurisdictional islands of Ann Arbor Township) close proximity to Lodi Township. Public sanitary sewer and water service is provided within the City of Ann Arbor.

Review of Plan in Context of Contiguous Community Master Plans

The proposed Township Plan update is consistent with the master plans of adjacent communities.

Applicable Agency Comments

Washtenaw County Public Health: See attached

Washtenaw Area Transportation Study (WATS): See attached



**Public Health Review and Comment for:
Lodi Township Master Plan Update 2008-09 Draft**

1. The plan includes elements that **increase access to physical activity.**

	Not Addressed	Somewhat Addressed	Adequately Addressed	Not Applicable To this review
A. Opportunities for use of non-motorized transportation are evident in the plan (bikeability, walkability, multi-use paths).	1	<u>3</u>	5	N/A
B. Connectivity between schools and residential areas are promoted in the plan (Safe Routes to School).	<u>1</u>	3	5	N/A
C. Preservation of green/open space including parks is evident in this plan.	1	<u>3</u>	5	N/A

General Comments:

- The “Bicycle Paths” section within Part 11: Transportation begins to explore bicycle pathways and the discusses the importance of connecting bicycle pathways to parks and recreation.
- Consider adding a map/inventory of existing infrastructure and deficiencies of sidewalks, bike paths, wide shoulders, etc.
- Consider stating support for the Washtenaw County Non-Motorized Plan.
- Consider addressing the transportation and safety concerns of children traveling to/from schools. (Safe Routes to School Program)

2. The plan includes elements that **increase access to healthy eating resources.**

	Not Addressed	Somewhat Addressed	Adequately Addressed	Not Applicable To this review
A. The plan promotes mixed use development (retail	1	<u>3</u>	5	N/A

including access to grocery stores and residential uses).

B. Grocery stores and super-markets can be accessed by non-motorized transportation.	<u>1</u>	3	5	N/A
C. The plan includes elements that support or improve the local food system (including preservation of agricultural land /urban agriculture and community gardens).	1	3	<u>5</u>	N/A

General Comments:

3. The plan includes elements that promote emotional well-being and social connectivity.

	Not Addressed	Somewhat Addressed	Adequately Addressed	Not Applicable To this review
A. The plan includes elements that promote the use of, and access to, public transportation.	1	<u>3</u>	5	N/A
B. The plan includes elements that promote connectivity between residential development and retail.	1	<u>3</u>	5	N/A
C. The plan incorporates affordable housing options into residential developments.	1	<u>3</u>	5	N/A
D. The plan includes built elements that increase community cohesion and neighborhood activities.	1	<u>3</u>	5	N/A

General Comments:

References:

- 1) Washtenaw County Public Health comments for Environment and Planning Master Plan.

- 2) Design Guidelines for Active Michigan Communities (2006). Available at: www.mihealthtools.org/communities
- 3) Promoting Active Communities (PAC). Available at: www.mihealthtools.org/communities
- 4) Robert Wood Johnson: Active Living Research
 - a. Designing for Active Recreation (Updated February 2005).
 - b. Designing for Active Transportation (Updated February 2005)Available at: http://www.activelivingresearch.org/index.php/What_We_are_Learning/117

W
A
T
S



WASHTENAW AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY

705 NORTH ZEEB ROAD 2ND FLOOR
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN 48103-1560
PHONE: (734) 994-3127 FAX: (734) 994-3129
WEBSITE: WWW.MIWATS.ORG
E MAIL: WATS@MIWATS.ORG

Planning Reviews

Community: **Date Received:** December 12, 2008

Complete Master Plan Update: **Complete Zoning Plan Update:**

Master Plan Amendment: **Zoning Plan Amendment:**

Other:

The map references are incomplete and out of order. Some of the maps provided were not included or were illegible. Some of the maps were referenced without a map number. It would be more useful to have the maps included in the text near where they are referenced.

The Central area descriptions and views of the special use area/Central Area are difficult to follow, as they do not seem to relate to each other. It is unclear from the pictures or text whether the long term vision includes the retention of the council farm grounds. The plan also states that the Central area will not have municipal services but calls for sidewalks and curbing along both Ann Arbor-Saline and Pleasant Lake. Where will the storm water runoff go if there are no underground sewers.

Land Use Implications:

The plan uses various density numbers for residential uses – ½ to 2 acres yet throughout the document speaks to the need to retain agriculture and rural character. The residential densities are really more suburban and should probably change based on the area.

Transportation Component Implications:

Page 37, 4.08 Roads – This section should probably speak to the existing conditions of all transportation. The second paragraph does not speak to existing conditions as it does to what the impact of improvement would be and probably belongs in the transportation policies section.

Page 76, 11.01 B. WATS suggests restating this as follows (as the township should not necessarily be recommending increased speed) : Retain capacity and efficiency of arterials.

POLICY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

• CITY OF ANN ARBOR • ANN ARBOR TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY • ANN ARBOR TOWNSHIP • CITY OF CHELSEA • VILLAGE OF DEXTER •
• DEXTER TOWNSHIP • EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY • MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION • NORTHFIELD TOWNSHIP • FITTSFIELD TOWNSHIP •
• CITY OF SALINE • SCIO TOWNSHIP • SOUTHWEST WASHTENAW COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS • SUPERIOR TOWNSHIP • UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN •
• WASHTENAW COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS • WASHTENAW COUNTY ROAD COMMISSION • CITY OF YPSILANTI • YPSILANTI TOWNSHIP •
• EX OFFICIO: FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION • SOUTHEAST MICHIGAN COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS •

AN INTERMUNICIPALITY COMMITTEE ORGANIZED UNDER ACT 200 OF PUBLIC ACTS OF MICHIGAN (1957)
REPRESENTING WASHTENAW COUNTY

Page 77, 11.02 Transportation Guidelines B. – The streets should include sidewalks in addition to curb and gutters.

Page 77, 11.02, G. Consider changing “..reduce the need for additional lanes..” to “retain capacity”.

Page 77, 11.03 Goal, Objectives, and Policies – Hierarchy of Roadways – WATS would recommend using the National Functional Classification of roads that dictates eligibility for federal funding

The existing NFC roads in Lodi Township are as follows:

Minor Arterials

Scio Church from Ann Arbor CL to Zeeb
Wagner from Scio Church to Ann Arbor-Saline
Ann Arbor-Saline from Wagner to Saline CL

Collectors

Scio Church from Zeeb to Parker
Pleasant Lake – entire length
Saline Waterworks – entire length
Zeeb from Scio Church to Pleasant Lake

The Township should consider the inclusion of the Pavement Management data that is available for the Townships Nationally Functionally Classified roads. The data is available through WATS.

Page 78 and 78 Policies, The Township should uses a maximum of 120 feet of ROW as the maximum for the township roads however, the policies use only 86 feet for the Arterials. The Township should consider ROW's wide enough to allow for the entire width of the paved road, paved shoulders of 4-5 feet, space for ditches wide enough to adequately accommodate drainage and sidewalks if in the urban services or Central area of the township.

Page 80, B,(3) The fifty foot landscaped buffer along major federally funded roads would prohibit easy access to transit routes in the future particularly in the urban services or central area. Wagner Road in particular has dense residential use that is likely to be served by public transit in the future. Setting uses back from roads on transit routes makes them very unfriendly to pedestrians, bikers and transit users. Ann Arbor-Saline is also a route likely to be served by public transit. In the central or urban services area, minimum setbacks with parking located behind uses would be most conducive to non-motorized trips and support public transit use.

Page 81, C, are the listed items Policies? It is often unclear what are the policies and what is just educational information.

Page 83 D. Pedestrian/Bicycle Circulation – the first statement is not a complete thought as it is unclear whether these are to be supported or discouraged because it lacks a verb.

Page 83 D, 1.a.1) a) d) these statements in bullets are essentially the same as the paragraph in 1.c.1) a). There is much duplication throughout this document. There is no direction as to where the bicycle facilities should be constructed, ie along roads or off road between developments. WATS would like to see the Lodi Township plan incorporate the recommendations from the WATS Non-motorized Plan. This would include the provision of paved shoulders along federally classified roads.

Page 84, E. Public Transportation – In addition to the recommendations for bus stops in the Municipal Service Area, there will need to be stops along the entire route within the Township. The Plan should also incorporate the recommendations from the WATS Transit Plan for Washtenaw County that includes the provision of demand response/door to door service throughout the township. The Park and Ride lots should be coordinated with the public transit stops.

Page 84, F. Internal Roadway Design with new Developments – this section belongs with Road Systems for new Development on page 81 as most of it is duplicative of what is already in the document.

Page 85, G. 1. e. remove the ability to waive non-motorized facilities by the Planning Commission as even in the rural area paved shoulders improve the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists in the rural area.

Page 85, G.1. a. the setbacks established should be minimized in the Central, Municipal or Urban Services area.

Page 85, 2. d. Add paved shoulders as an option for bicycle facilities along Township roads.