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The City of Plymouth Master Plan sets forth a vision for our community. It is a guide that all City boards and departments can use to help make planning and development decisions. The Plan communicates a vision for future land uses. Planning is a process and requires residents, property owners, business owners, city officials, staff, and others — all with diverse backgrounds, ideals, and visions — to work towards a common vision. This common vision is achieved through discussions, surveys, and open public meetings. The Master Plan seeks to clarify who we are, where we are, and where we are going. More so, the Master Plan is the culmination of past, present, and future visions of City planning.

The Master Plan identifies goals for Plymouth’s future to express long-term expectations, and addresses the fundamental issues that the City expects to face in the future. By using the Master Plan as a guide, City boards and departments can coordinate planning activities toward outcomes that best fit with the long range goals outlined by the Master Plan.

The Master Plan consists of two main components: text and map. The text of the Plan should be consulted for a description of policies that apply to specific areas or features. The Future Land Use Map is intended to illustrate the desired locations of certain land uses in the community. Other maps are included throughout the Plan to provide additional details not mentioned in the text. If there is inconsistency between the text of the Plan and the map, the text will control City Policy.

Michigan Planning Enabling Act

Under the Michigan Planning Enabling Act (Act 33 of the Public Act of 2008), communities are required to review their Master Plan every five years, and update it if needed. Plymouth’s previous Master Plan was most recently amended in 2011. The 2011 update followed a previous revision in 2009, which fully replaced the Master Plan adopted in 1996.
Making Development Decisions in the City

Development decisions in Michigan are permitted by and regulated through two main laws: the Planning Enabling Act and the Zoning Enabling Act. While many other local, state, and federal laws could come into play, these two laws outline the basic steps that a local government must take to plan for and regulate development within its boundaries. These laws balance the rights of the property owner with a local government’s responsibility to protect the health, safety, and welfare of its residents.

Reviewing and approving development proposals can be a complex process. In many instances, various boards and departments are responsible for reviewing and approving new development in Plymouth. The following describes, in general, the responsibilities of the City:

**Community Development Department (CDD)**
The City's Community Development Department is the initial contact between the City, developers, and residents. It receives all development applications and supporting materials. The department also assists developers with informational requirements and procedures outlined in the Zoning Ordinance. The Building Official, Fire Marshall, and various specialty inspectors work with applicants once the development proposal has been approved by the appropriate commission. Plans submitted to these officials are reviewed for conformance with applicable codes and ordinances. These professionals ensure that construction meets the Plymouth Zoning Ordinance, Michigan Building Code, the Michigan Residential Code, and/or State and National Trade Codes.

**Planning Commission (PC)**
The responsibility of the Planning Commission is to guide and advance the efficient, coordinated development of the City in a manner that will promote the health, safety, and general welfare of its residents. They are the primary commission that reviews development proposals. The Planning Commission reviews projects to ensure that development adheres to the City's Master Plan, Zoning Ordinance, and allows a reasonable use of the property. Note: The Planning Commission does not review proposals for individual single-family or two-family residences.

**City Commission (CC)**
Some proposals, such as a Planned Unit Development or re-zoning a property, must be reviewed and approved by the City Commission. The Planning Commission conducts an initial review and makes a recommendation to the City Commission. The City Commission then makes the final decision based upon criteria and requirements in the Zoning Ordinance.

**Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA)**
The Zoning Board of Appeals hears variance requests from property owners or developers who, because of hardships or practical difficulty, cannot meet the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and feel there is a unique circumstance that limits the applicability of certain requirements.

**Historic District Commission (HDC)**
The City of Plymouth has a Historic District that is enabled by the Local Historic Districts Act (PA 169 of 1970). In general, properties surrounding or adjacent to Kellogg Park are within the boundaries of the Historic District. If development is proposed on a property within the Historic District, the proposal must also go before the Historic District Commission for consideration, review, and approval. The Historic District Commission uses the National Park Service’s Secretary of Interior Standards to review projects within the District.
Downtown Development Authority (DDA)
The City of Plymouth has also instituted a Downtown Development Authority (enabled through the Downtown Development Authority Act, PA 197 of 1975). DDAs are designed to be a catalyst in the development of a community’s downtown district. They provide for a variety of funding options to be used to fund public improvements in the downtown district. These improvements not only benefit residents and visitors, but also help create a favorable environment for businesses to thrive. The DDA does not have any authority to review development proposals on private property.
A Master Plan survey was developed to gather opinions on how various areas of the City should develop in the future. The survey was organized by area, and the following types of development and areas were focused upon:

**Single-Family Residential Development**

The first section of the survey asked respondents to give their opinion about new single-family homes and residential additions. Nearly three-quarters of respondents felt that new single-family homes were too big for the lot. Less than forty percent of respondents believed residential additions were too big for the lot. Respondents were two times more likely to feel that additions were the right size for the lot rather than new single family homes.

The Planning Commission is committed to addressing the issues raised in the comment portion of this section of the survey. The comments included a dislike of the loss of mature trees on private property, a desire to protect the character and charm of existing neighborhoods, and a desire for homes to be proportional to their lots.

Comments in support of new home construction stated that new homes enhance property values of all homeowners in the city, modernize the city, and assist in maintaining a thriving downtown. Supporters of new residential homes believed that property owners should be able to build to the extent allowed in the ordinances.

Other comments raised by respondents have sparked further discussion about the future development of the city. These comments have been generalized but include the following:

- Economic and social diversity are important to a strong community – balance is needed.
- Individual home buyers are being priced out of the city.
- New homes all look the same.
Multi-Family Residential Development

The next set of questions asked respondents their opinion about the type and location of multi-family housing. Slightly fewer than fifty percent of respondents wanted to see the existing ratio of single-family to apartments, townhomes, condos, and duplexes remain the same. Approximately thirty percent of respondents who wanted to see a change in the housing stock wanted more single family residential or more townhomes/condominiums. Respondents felt that new multi-family housing should be located in or near Old Village and downtown and/or along main roads such as Mill, Main, Starkweather or Ann Arbor Trail.

General comments that the Planning Commission has considered to be important to the future development of the city include:
- Multi-family housing units that fit the character of the neighborhood (duplexes, townhomes).
- Housing that considers the needs of the aging population (ranch style, no stairs).

Downtown Development

The survey questions regarding the downtown focused on desirable building characteristics, pedestrian amenities, and parking. More than half of respondents wanted buildings that are set back from the street similarly, have a mixture of uses between each floor, and that historic buildings are preserved. Respondents found that most of the amenities provided downtown are sufficient, but felt that bike racks and drinking fountains were lacking. Responses showed a general desire for the physical form of parking in the downtown to be available in 1-2 story decks and on surface lots. Nearly three-quarters of respondents were not in favor of implementing paid parking.

Overall, written comments praised Plymouth’s downtown. The Planning Commission, DDA, and City Commission may choose to address the parking and pedestrian amenity concerns that were raised. These concerns include the lack of signalized pedestrian crossings in and near downtown, a desire for additional public restrooms, the necessity for additional bike racks, and the desire for more publicly controlled parking.

Old Village Development

Questions regarding desirable building characteristics and pedestrian amenities were also asked for Old Village. Similar to the desired characteristics of downtown, respondents desire preservation of historic buildings, buildings that are set back from the street similarly, and a mixture of uses between floors. Respondents also viewed variable style as a desirable characteristic of buildings within Old Village. Regarding pedestrian amenities, respondents found that Old Village was insufficient, particularly as compared to the amenities provided downtown. Drinking fountains, bike racks, and benches were overwhelmingly noted as insufficient.
Written comments about Old Village viewed the area as having great potential, a unique charm, and lots of historic character. The Planning Commission and City Commission may consider the comments specific to future development which includes: encouraging retail space and restaurants, streetscape improvements and increased funding for such, and preserving the significant historic buildings within the area.

**South Main Street Development**

Respondents were asked what they would be in favor of seeing if the South Main Street area was redeveloped. This area includes those properties with Main Street frontage between Wing Street and Ann Arbor Road. A majority of respondents were in favor of locating parking at the rear of the buildings. Largely, respondents want to see driveways and parking areas shared between buildings, buildings set back from the sidewalk (not built up to the sidewalk), and buildings similarly set back from the street. Roughly less than half of respondents were in favor of a mix of uses across floors.

Written comments about South Main Street echoed the selections made desiring parking and driveways at the rear of buildings. Other comments included wanting to see a cohesive streetscape and increasing pedestrian amenities like crosswalks.

**North Main Street Development**

The survey asked the same question about North Main Street as it did about South Main Street. The area being considered in this question is between Church Street and N. Mill Street. A majority of respondents were in favor of locating parking at the rear of buildings, setting buildings back from the street at a similar distance, and sharing driveways and parking areas between buildings. Comments stated that this area could be redeveloped to eliminate the suburban “strip mall” pattern and that new development should be more consistent with Plymouth’s downtown. Streetscape and pedestrian improvements were suggested in addition to making PARC a centerpiece of North Main Street.

**Historic District**

Nearly three-quarters of respondents would be in favor of a historic district to preserve historically significant homes in residential neighborhoods. Less than fifteen percent were not in favor of a residential historic district while the remaining ten percent had no opinion or were unsure.

General comments related to a residential historic district included a desire to only include historically significant properties and while others questioned the process of designation and enforcement for a residential district.
Bicycle Amenities and Sidewalks / Crosswalks

Questions about bicycle amenities, designated routes, and preferred destinations were also included in the survey. Many comments stated that more bike racks are needed downtown and in city parks. Respondents were more in favor of pavement markings for dedicated bike lanes than roadway signage indicating bicycle routes and pavement marking for shared vehicle/bicycle use. Favored bike routes included Ann Arbor Trail, North and South Harvey, and North and South Main while a quarter of respondents didn’t think any street should be designated as a bike route. Lastly, destinations where people want to visit by bicycle include downtown, city parks, Hines Drive, and Old Village.

Respondents listed a number of intersections that needed a crosswalk signal or improvements to the sidewalk/crosswalk (see Appendix for more detail). Regarding the condition of sidewalks, most thought they were kept in good repair.

Tree Canopy

The survey ended with a question about the street tree program and street trees throughout the city. The majority of respondents feel that there are a sufficient number of street trees in downtown, Old Village, and residential neighborhoods. Respondents feel North and South Main have an insufficient number of street trees. Forty percent of respondents were not aware the city has a street tree program, indicating additional education and marketing may be necessary. Additionally, comments were received that native trees should be included in the permitted list of street trees.

Several respondents suggested offering incentives for planting trees on private property. Many respondents shared concerns about trees being removed for new residential construction. These respondents think that mature trees are a defining neighborhood characteristic, and suggested there should be a replacement requirement for trees removed for new construction. They also suggested the city provide incentives and/or requirements to protect trees with large diameters during construction.

Survey Information

The Master Plan Survey was available on the City’s website from August 1 to 15, 2016, and received 1,035 responses. Of those, 901 are city residents, most of who own/live in a single-family home. The survey questions and the detailed summary are provided in the Appendix.
The goals for development in the City of Plymouth were developed using public input from the Master Plan survey, public meetings, and many Planning Commission discussions. These goals complement the City Commission’s Strategic Plan, as shown in the table below, and should be re-evaluated on an annual basis for compatibility with the Strategic Plan. How these goals may be accomplished is discussed in subsequent chapters of this Master Plan.

Table 1: Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Commission Strategic Plan Goal Topics</th>
<th>Guiding Master Plan Goals for Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| GOAL I QUALITY OF LIFE                    | • Encourage appropriate home sizing & massing.  
  • Create lifelong neighborhoods of diverse housing for various income levels.  
  • Maintain and enhance the tree canopy.  
  • Encourage historic preservation. |
| GOAL II FINANCIAL STABILITY               | • Plan for a variety of land uses that creates a dynamic environment supportive of residences, community institutions, and businesses. |
| GOAL III ECONOMIC VITALITY                | • Promote a welcoming environment for commercial business & industry.  
  • Encourage environmentally sensitive/context sensitive and sustainable development. |
| GOAL IV SERVICE INFRASTRUCTURE            | • Improve street mobility, connectivity & safety.  
  • Plan for vehicular needs, including parking. |
This chapter provides an overview of future land uses throughout the City. It identifies the desired land use for each parcel of land on the map and provides a description for each use.

The following describes each future land use category and the desired characteristics of each district. The future land use plan indicates the desired use of parcels throughout the City and coordinates with the proposed changes noted in Zoning Plan.

**Single-Family Residential: Low Density**

Lots that are planned for Single Family Residential Low Density are in areas that have developed single family homes on larger lots, and have more “suburban” character with ranch-style homes well setback from the street, and large expanses of open, undeveloped space on each lot. Desired density in this area is not greater than three dwelling units per acre, or a minimum lot size of 12,000 square feet.

**Single-Family Residential: Medium Density**

Areas planned for Single Family Residential Medium Density are arranged in a traditional grid pattern. These areas occupy most of the residential development in the City and are characterized by original plats that are 25 to 50 feet wide. These parcels have a desired density of between nine and six dwelling units per acre. New lots created in this designation should be developed at a lot size of 7,200 square feet. Homes in this land use category are generally placed the same distance from the street with front porches and detached garages in the rear of the property.

**Residential Vision Statement**

Homes in the City of Plymouth shall contribute to the character and desirability of the City. They shall maintain the walkable character of the neighborhoods, with appropriate heights relative to the street, and appropriate distance from sidewalks. They shall be built size-appropriate to their lots, allowing adequate space and sunlight to neighboring homes. They shall maximize green space and trees, and minimize concrete surfaces to allow for both the continued forestation of Plymouth, and allow for the City infrastructure’s water management.
Multi-Family Residential: Low Density

The Multi-Family Residential Low Density designation is intended to identify appropriate locations for duplex and triplex style housing. The character of these units is similar to traditional single family residential areas, but requires additional parking to accommodate the higher density. Therefore, this land use designation is generally located along collector streets. They are also located in areas where existing duplex and triplex units are currently located, with a desired density of up to a maximum of 12 units per acre, or a minimum lot size of 3,500 square feet.

Multi-Family Residential: Medium Density

The Multi-Family Residential Medium Density housing category plans for townhouse, row house, multiplexes, and various other styles of housing that mimic the pattern of single family residential uses, but in a higher density of 12-18 dwelling units per acre, with maximum building heights of 2.5 stories. Medium-density, multiple-family developments are best located as a transition between single/two-family residential areas and commercial or office areas along main streets with higher traffic volumes. This future land use category represents a housing type that young professionals/families, and empty-nesters/seniors could use to either enter the Plymouth housing market or downsize from a single family.

Multi-Family Residential: High Density

This higher-density, multiple-family residential district will also provide an alternative housing option within the City, but in a traditional apartment building form. Buildings in this land use designation are characterized by a single, centralized entrance rather than one exterior entrance per unit. Desirable unit types would include loft apartments and ranch-style apartments, with parking accessed from the back of the building. Density for this category ranges from 18-27 dwelling units per acre, with a maximum building height of four stories.

Mixed Use: Low Density

The Mixed Use Low Density designation is specific to land uses where it is appropriate to have a low-impact commercial use adjacent to single family or multi-family residential areas. This land use allows for single and multi-family uses to continue and be established, while encouraging lower-intensity commercial and office uses that can serve the residential areas. The Mixed Use Low Density land use designation is generally detached buildings with the character of single family residences that are no more than two stories. Parking in this land use should be located at the rear of the property.

Mixed Use: High Density

The Mixed Use High Density land use designation includes a mixture of retail, service, office, recreation, and residential uses. It is desirable in these areas to locate commercial uses on the ground floor of a building, with upper level office and/or residential uses. Properties within this land use category should be compatible with abutting uses. The mixed use designation has been applied to larger tracts of land that can accommodate various uses in a harmonious design, offering unique benefits to the residents/tenants, such as live-work or home-based-business opportunities, and pedestrian access to work or commercial businesses. The Mixed Use designation has also been applied to single lots that could accommodate a single, mixed-use building. Generally, buildings in Mixed Use High Density have uniform setbacks which are zero-lot line, and match with the...
character of the buildings in Downtown. Parking should be located at the rear of the building or integrated and hidden within any new construction. Generally, this land use designation should not exceed 3 stories, with some locations along major streets potentially appropriate at 4 stories.

Office-Service

Office uses, such as professional offices, medical, and personal service establishments are accommodated in this land use category. This district is the least intensive of the other commercial districts, and could accommodate some upper level residential uses if part of a mixed-use project. Residential densities should be limited to the medium-density multi-family density, or up to 12-18 dwelling units per acre. This category also provides a transitional area between residential and commercial districts.

Local Business - Retail/Service

The Local Business-Retail/Service designation is the lowest-intensity business category of three commercial land use designations. It is designed for convenient shopping for residents of nearby residential areas, and permits land uses that satisfy limited specialty shopping. Local Business would not include intensive business types or businesses that depend on high volumes of traffic. This category may also accommodate residential uses on upper levels, if deemed appropriate for the individual location, at a density of up to 12-18 dwelling units per acre.

Central Business - Retail

The Central Business-Retail district (CBD) land use designation provides the central gathering place and commercial area of the City, accommodating pedestrian access to local businesses, restaurants, and entertainment, as well as office and upper-level residential uses. It serves the retail, office, convenience, and service needs for the entire City. The CBD promotes uses which provide convenient pedestrian shopping and services along a continuous retail frontage. In addition, it provides opportunities for upper-level residential uses, which should be provided at a density of up to 18-27 dwelling units per acre. Most of the CBD area is served by centralized parking under the City’s control. The CBD area also coincides with the City of Plymouth Downtown Development Authority.
General Business - Retail/Service

The General Business-Retail/Service is the broadest and most-intensive commercial land use category. Areas designated as General Business-Retail/Service are located along main thoroughfares and are automobile dependent, benefiting from the exposure of high-traffic volumes. While these uses are generally accessed by vehicle, pedestrian access across the site is desirable. Businesses include a wide range of retail and service establishments, including drive-through restaurants, auto-service establishments and commercial uses serving a regional clientele. Limited residential uses may be appropriate on upper levels, but are considered a subordinate use to the principal commercial intent of this designation. Residential densities of up to 18-27 dwelling units on upper levels may be accommodated in appropriate locations.

Industrial/Research

The Industrial/Research land use designation is intended to primarily accommodate wholesale activities, warehouses, and light industrial operations whose external and physical effects are restricted to the immediate area having only a minimal effect on surrounding districts. This designation is also structured to permit the manufacturing, compounding, processing, packaging and assembling of finished or semi-finished products from previously-prepared materials. Research and development land uses are appropriate for this designation and the increased use of technology to mitigate typical industrial-type nuisances is encouraged. Uses that are more conducive to a residential community are encouraged.

Institutional

This designation includes places of worship, schools (elementary, middle and high schools), and government offices or service areas and buildings such as City Hall, the Department of Municipal Services (DMS) yard, Library, Historical Museum, parking areas, etc.

Parks and Open Space

The Parks and Open Space land use category includes existing parkland and open/green spaces, as well as proposed parks that are identified in the City’s Recreation Master Plan. In addition to City-owned parks, this category also includes the County-owned River Rouge Parkway. This land use category is intended to protect parklands and open space from future development that does not consider the public benefit of retaining such land. In areas where open green space cannot be retained, Single-Family Residential: Low Density development is preferred.

Future Land Use Map

The Land Use Plan is depicted on the Future Land Use Map on the following page. This plan incorporates the land use categories defined above and arranges them to guide long-term growth and redevelopment of the City.

The Future Land Use Map is a long range vision of how land uses should evolve over time and should not be confused with the City’s Zoning Map, which is a current (short range) mechanism for regulating development.

Additionally, the Future Land Use Map is generalized. Any rezoning consideration requires a more detailed evaluation by the Planning Commission.
Future Land Use Designations

- Single Family Low Density
- Single Family Medium Density
- Multi-Family: Low Density
- Multi-Family: Medium Density
- Multi-Family: High Density
- Mixed Use Low Density
- Mixed Use High Density
- Office
- Local Business
- Central Business
- General Business
- Industrial
- Institutional
- Parks
This chapter provides more detailed ideas of how specific areas in the City could be developed in the future. It puts to paper design principles for setbacks, building height, pedestrian amenities, open space, and other topics. This guidance works with the future land use designations and provides more detailed directions for development in particular areas of the City.

The sub-area plans address the following sections of the community:

1. Central downtown area
2. Old village area
3. North and South Main Street areas
4. South Mill Street area
5. Ann Arbor Road corridor
Downtown Sub Area Plan

PLANNING FRAMEWORK & LAND USE
- The City of Plymouth’s downtown is a vibrant, pedestrian-friendly environment characterized by an attractive collection of retail shops, restaurants, offices, residences, parks, and public amenities.
- The continued growth and development of downtown Plymouth is enhanced by development policies which foster this long range vision.
- Land use policies for the downtown encourage a mix of land uses including retail, restaurant, office, residential, park, and public uses. This mix of uses is supported by the B-2 zoning district classification.
- Land uses which promote the interface of building occupants and public areas are encouraged. This includes outdoor cafes and attractive retail window displays.

STREETSCAPES & PUBLIC SPACES
- The DDA has identified long-term improvement projects to the downtown. These include brick paver upgrades, traffic signal mast arms, landscaping, and general improvements.
- Kellogg Park is a main downtown Plymouth attraction. The City should manage the park in a manner which complements nearby businesses, promotes community activities and festivals, and maintains park quality.
- The City should promote plazas open to the public, outdoor cafes and pedestrian areas which provide attractive green space and pedestrian amenities.
- The City should maintain and enhance its quality streetscape and public sidewalk areas. Permeable brick pavers, landscaping, lighting, public art, street furniture and attractive signage are important components of the downtown ambiance.

FORM & SITE DESIGN
- To encourage development which reinforces pedestrian activity along streets, building fronts shall be placed at the street right-of-way line or no more than 12 feet back from the right-of-way.
- Building architecture should be compatible with sidewalk areas and provide an attractive interface between building and pedestrians. Quality architecture shall be emphasized with generous window areas, building recesses, and architectural details.
- Architectural interest should be provided through the use of color, texture, and materials, with special details for primary building entrances.

SURVEY RESPONSES ON DOWNTOWN
The Master Plan Survey asked respondents to name characteristics that are desirable for the buildings in the downtown area. A majority want buildings to be set back from the street similarly, buildings to have a mix of uses, and for buildings that are historic to be preserved. Other desirable characteristics include buildings that are variable in style and buildings that have one primary entrance per storefront.
Downtown Sub Area Plan

South Main at Kellogg Park

PARKING & CIRCULATION
- The City and DDA should continue improvements of the central parking deck and acquire additional public parking at strategic locations.
- New parking lots and structures must make a positive contribution to the street edge and pedestrian areas.
- Where possible, surface parking areas should be screened with perimeter landscaping, knee walls, or ornamental fencing.
- Public parking areas should be connected to the central business areas through well-maintained sidewalks and pedestrian passageways.
- If new parking structures are developed, the City should integrate retail buildings and pedestrian amenities within the structure.
- The City should maintain an attractive wayfinding system which easily identifies public parking, shopping, and community facilities.

SURVEY RESPONSES ON PARKING
The Master Plan Survey asked what form parking should take in the Downtown area. A majority preferred Downtown parking to be in the form of 1-2 story parking decks. Slightly fewer respondents responded that surface lots, striping on-street parking at the edges of downtown, and 3/4 story decks were favorable. Valet service and shuttle service were considered undesirable options for parking.

Additionally, the Master Plan Survey asked where public parking should be placed/expanded in the Downtown area. Respondents preferred locations behind the Library and City Hall, at the existing Central Parking Deck, and at the former Saxton’s property.

Table 2: DDA 2018 Strategic Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify alternative Funding Sources</td>
<td>Develop a vision/plan to explore and identify alternative funding mechanisms for capital improvement projects. Plan should include “Action Plan” that identifies steps for obtaining funding via each funding source.</td>
<td>DDA Board</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>DDA Funding/Grants/Public-Private Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish a DDA Finance Committee.</td>
<td>DDA Board</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>No Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Parking Inventory</td>
<td>Create Comprehensive Parking Plan that determines existing and future parking needs, and 1-5 year vision for parking facilities, including reconstruction of parking deck. Plan should also identify, evaluate and prioritize funding and revenue sources (paid parking assessments, private/public partnerships, advertising, etc.).</td>
<td>DDA Board/Parking Sub-Committee</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>Paid Parking, Assessments, Public-Private Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assist in moving Saxton’s development project forward by hosting/participating in joint planning meeting to discuss site plan features with the City Commission and Planning Commission.</td>
<td>City Administration/DDA Staff/Planning Commission</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>No Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make Downtown More Pedestrian Friendly</td>
<td>Repair/replace tree grates; maintain existing and install where needed. Investigate tree grates made of more flexible material to avoid heaving.</td>
<td>DDA Staff</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>DDA Funding/Public-Private partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create a sense of arrival/entryway into downtown by improving pedestrian crossings identified in 2017 goals [Main/Church, Harvey/Penniman, Harvey/Wing and Main/Wing].</td>
<td>DDA Staff</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td>DDA Budget/City Grant/Budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create tree lighting plan to provide full LED display on all trees within desired boundary (purchase, installation and maintenance)</td>
<td>DDA Staff</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>DDA Budget/Pedestrian Partnerships with Property and Business Owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase lighting, especially in alleys</td>
<td>DDA Staff</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>DDA Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop and implement Kellogg Park improvements [turf, preserve tree canopy, more permanent solution for bandstand] by creating a fundraising campaign [brick pavers, corporate sponsorship, donations].</td>
<td>City Commission/DDA Board</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td>Fundraising/Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fountain Completion</td>
<td>City Commission</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>Wilcox Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Businesses</td>
<td>Support business mix by creating a clearinghouse of all requirements (i.e. site development, marketing properties to decrease vacancies, façade improvement program, Redevelopment Ready Communities [RRC] Program)</td>
<td>DDA Staff/City Administration/City Commission</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>No Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Items</td>
<td>Develop plan for DDA future street lighting upgrade and phased implementation</td>
<td>DDA Staff</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>No Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete a study of infrastructure in the DDA including electricity, plumbing, water, sidewalks, and trees.</td>
<td>DDA Staff/City Administration</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>DDA Budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLANNING FRAMEWORK & LAND USE
- The Old Village area should be a compatible mix of residential, office, commercial and light industrial uses.
- The land uses should be arranged in a manner which complements the historic character of the Old Village.
- Intensive commercial uses which have a negative impact on nearby residential areas should not be allowed.
- Upper level residences located above first floor commercial or office uses are encouraged.
- Light industrial uses shall be allowed to continue but shall be buffered and screened from nearby residential uses.
- The mix of land uses will allow higher residential density in order to promote the Old Village vitality and pedestrian ambiance.
- Pedestrian and vehicular connectivity between Old Village and downtown and Old Village and Hines Park should be explored and enhanced.
- Old Village shall serve as an attractive, well-designed gateway.

FORM & SITE DESIGN
- Liberty Street between Starkweather and Mill streets shall function as the village center for the Old Village with a collection of restaurants, taverns and shops.
- The historic architecture shall be preserved.
- Streetscape improvements including lighting, sidewalk enhancements and landscaping should be implemented.
- Variable setbacks ranging from zero to 15’ shall be established on an average block basis in order to maintain block integrity.
- Building heights shall not exceed 2-3 stories in appropriate areas.
- The City should promote public and private plazas, and attractive greenspace for gatherings.

SURVEY RESPONSES ON OLD VILLAGE
The Master Plan Survey asked respondents to name characteristics that are desirable for the buildings in the Old Village area. A large majority want buildings that are historic to be preserved. Other desirable characteristics include buildings that are variable in style, have mixed use across floors, and buildings that are set back from the street similarly.

PARKING & CIRCULATION
- The Old Village shall promote a safe and attractive pedestrian circulation system.
- The mix of residential and commercial uses will promote pedestrian scale development.
- Sidewalks in the village center area should be wider with barrier free ramps at intersections.
- The City should explore converting private parking areas to municipal controlled lots.
- On street parking should be promoted as a viable alternative to off street parking for the village center area and commercial district.

*This rendering is informational only and may not reflect changes to parking configurations since its creation in 1998 or as referenced in the 2011 Master Plan.
PLANNING FRAMEWORK & LAND USE

- South and North Main Street should be a mix of residential, office and commercial uses arranged in a compatible framework with adjoining single-family neighborhood areas.
- Intensive commercial uses such as drive thru restaurants, gas stations and large format retail are not allowed.
- Local Business (B-1) type uses are permitted, which can be situated on limited-size lots and which provide appropriate buffers to adjoining single-family residential uses.
- South and North Main shall serve as an attractive, well-designed gateway to the downtown area.

FORM & SITE DESIGN

- Where possible, the following streetscape improvements should be implemented: additional street trees, decorative street lighting, public art, and gateway or welcome signs.
- Locate parking at the rear of buildings. Share driveways and parking areas between uses/lots.
- Landscape strips or decorative knee walls should separate front yard parking and sidewalk areas.
- Adjoining single-family residential areas should be properly buffered by means of landscape strips, berms, and/or screening walls.
- North Main Street should be improved with street trees and streetscape improvements and building fronts shall be placed at the street right-of-way line or no more than 12 feet back from the right-of-way to encourage pedestrian activity.

CIRCULATION

- South and North Main Streets should provide a safe and attractive pedestrian corridor leading to the downtown.
- Pedestrian improvements should consider greater sidewalk width and barrier-free ramps at intersections.
- Designated pedestrian crosswalks should be identified with signage and/or pedestrian cross bars at Ann Arbor Road, Burroughs and Wing Street.
- Where feasible, pedestrian refuge islands should be considered at various points along Main Street.
- Traffic calming solutions should be explored for the corridor and may include curb bump outs, refuge islands and rumble strips.
- The City should consider alternative road cross sections such as two thru lanes, parking lanes, and bicycle lanes.
- Include access management standards within the zoning ordinance to minimize curb cuts and turning conflicts.
PLANNING FRAMEWORK & LAND USE
- South Mill provides redevelopment opportunities for mixed use development including single family residences, multi-family residences, recreation, neighborhood commercial and industrial uses.
- The vacant Bathey site provides a prime redevelopment opportunity for a mixed use planned unit development with a connection to North Main Street and compatibility with Old Village.
- Existing single family and multi-family uses should be maintained and buffered from industrial uses.
- Neighborhood commercial uses such as local business retail and service are designated for the intersection of Ann Arbor Trail and South Mill.
- Retain existing industrial uses around the railroad as appropriate, as they provide important employment opportunities and tax base for the City.

CIRCULATION
- Wayne County should improve South Mill by re-paving with two travel lanes, bike paths, curbs, and sidewalks.
- Storm sewers and curb inlets should be included in future road re-construction.
- A pedestrian connection should be considered through the Bathey site to North Main as well as an enlarged pedestrian connection to Hines Park along Park Drive.
- Coordinate long term road improvements with Wayne County such as access management strategies, curb cuts, deceleration lanes and turning lanes.

FORM & SITE DESIGN
- As redevelopment occurs, streetscape improvements should be implemented and should include additional street trees along the corridor, landscape screening along industrial properties and the school bus yard, and landscape strips and decorative knee walls at key commercial intersection of Ann Arbor Trail and South Mill.
- Gateway/entryway sign should be installed at South Mill near City limits.
- Provide unified streetscape elements along the South Mill corridor.
**Planning Framework & Land Use**
- The Ann Arbor Road Corridor is characterized by a variety of retail and service businesses that is best accessed by automobile.
- This district was developed in partnership with Plymouth Township and as such cannot be changed without consultation with and agreement from their Planning Commission.
- Land use policies for Ann Arbor Road primarily encourage professional offices, personal service establishments, restaurants and food service, and auto-oriented businesses.
- Land uses that promote pedestrian movement and accommodation are encouraged.

**Form, Site Design, and Streetscapes**
- The Ann Arbor Road Corridor has clearly defined design guidelines and streetscape requirements including specifications on signage, landscaping, fencing, building materials, and lighting.
- As more buildings are changing ownership and changing uses, sites are being improved which requires compliance with the district’s streetscape standards. It is expected that this will continue in future years.
- Public spaces can be greatly improved in this area. Increased sidewalk widths, inviting street furniture, and fewer curb cuts could make this area more pedestrian friendly.
- Ann Arbor Road is a state road and all street improvements are under the purview of MDOT. Wayne County maintains the two roads (Sheldon and S. Mill/Lilley) that create the edges of this sub area.

**Plymouth Township’s Ann Arbor Road Corridor Sub Area Plan**

**Background**
In 1998, Plymouth Township and the City of Plymouth formed a joint Ann Arbor Road Corridor (ARC) District, which contains specific criteria for landscape, signage, and the appearance of buildings. The purpose of the joint zoning district was to create a visual cohesiveness on both sides of Ann Arbor Road and to foster a sense of place. To that end, the Township Downtown Development Authority (DDA) has financed major streetscape projects along the Township portion of the Ann Arbor Road Corridor. It is the Township’s perspective that continued investment in the Ann Arbor Road Corridor will help to prevent blight and ensure that this area remains a viable location for business.

**Key Concepts**
- As the prime commercial thoroughfare in Plymouth Township, the Ann Arbor Road Corridor has been recognized as a key focal area of the community.
- The requirements of the ARC District for landscape, signage, and the appearance of buildings help to improve the visual continuity of the area and foster a sense of place.
Transportation infrastructure is the backbone of a community, allowing residents and visitors to easily and safely move from home, to work, to play. These routes serve the driving public, as well as people who walk, use a wheelchair, or ride a bicycle to their destination. Well planned and maintained roads and sidewalks also feed the economic engine of a community’s commercial district, and create dynamic places where people want to gather and enjoy a high quality of life.

In 2010, the State of Michigan legislature signed into law the Complete Streets amendments. A “complete street” provides facilities that allow all users, irrespective of their age or abilities, to use the street as a mode of transportation. A complete street allows motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists, and those with disabilities to easily and safely use the roads in their community. Communities with complete streets policies help to ensure that roadways accommodate all users, not just motorists.

This chapter of the Master Plan looks at how the transportation system works in the City of Plymouth for all users. While it does not identify specific improvements for particular routes, it is the basis upon which a more detailed plan could be developed in the future.
Existing Conditions

Regional Setting
Before making improvements to the city’s transportation system, it is important to consider how the local system connects with adjacent transportation systems. This is true not only for Plymouth residents wanting to travel to other communities or nearby destinations, but also to allow visitors to come enjoy all that Plymouth has to offer. Plymouth’s downtown is a prime destination for many visitors given the broad array of annual events and dynamic downtown environment. Helping visitors reach the city by various modes of transportation will only increase its popularity.

There are many ways cyclists can access Plymouth via the street network. The Hines Park Pathway system and the Metro Trail along I-275, shown on the map above (Figure 9), are the two closest shared-use paths. The Hines Park Pathway is a 17-mile shared-use pathway which begins in Dearborn and ends in the City of Northville. The I-275 Metro Trail allows users
to bike along a 42-mile stretch from Novi to Monroe. Other points of access from the street network include (but not limited to) Ann Arbor Trail, Sheldon Road, and Plymouth Road.

**Plymouth’s Road Network**

Plymouth is conveniently located in close proximity to the regional highway system, accessed by arterial roads such as Sheldon Road, Plymouth Road, and Ann Arbor Road that connect the city with adjacent communities. These main roads narrow down into local roads once within the city’s boundaries, which form the grid around which Plymouth’s neighborhoods and commercial districts are organized.

Transportation improvements must be based on the current use, condition, and type of the existing roads in the network. The illustration titled “Existing Transportation Conditions” (Figure 11) on page 33 classifies each road according to the Michigan Department of Transportation’s (MDOT) hierarchical functional system. This road classification corresponds to roadway traffic volumes. Plymouth’s road network includes four classes of roads as described below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDOT National Functional Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code 1: Interstate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 2: Other Freeways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 3: Other Principal Arterials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 4: Minor Arterials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 5: Major Collectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 6: Minor Collectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 7: Local streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncoded: Not a certified public road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Principal arterial roads run relatively long distance and service travel movements to important traffic generators, such as dense commercial areas or employment centers. Sheldon Road, North Territorial Road (west of Sheldon), Ann Arbor Road, and Plymouth Road (east of Mill St.) belong in this category.
- Major collector roads funnel traffic from residential areas to arterial roads, with some providing direct access to residences. They include Main Street, Starkweather, Mill/Lilley, Farmer, Penniman, and Ann Arbor Trail.
- Minor collector roads serve more through-traffic than a local road but are not as heavily traveled as a major collector. These roads may directly serve schools, business districts and public functions but are less important than major collectors. Streets in this category include Church Street, Harvey, and Wing.
- Local roads are neighborhood streets that provide access to residences and include all other streets in Plymouth.

**Plymouth’s Sidewalk and Bicycle Facilities**

Almost all of Plymouth’s streets have a sidewalk on one side of the street, or both sides of the street. However, no formal bicycle amenities, such as bike lanes or shared-use paths, exist within the City. Many residents perceive the arterials such as Sheldon Road, Ann Arbor Road, and Mill/Lilley Street as unsafe and challenging because of the heavy volume and fast traffic flow. This concern was also voiced about using a bicycle through downtown Plymouth.

**Plymouth’s Destinations**

An important element of planning any transportation system is to identify the destinations that the system must serve within a community. The destinations are classified by land use, type of user, and the manner in which the user reaches the destination. The “Existing Transportation Conditions” map (Figure 11) on page 33 shows the various destinations within and adjacent to Plymouth, including shopping/entertainment districts, schools, community facilities, and parks.

**Survey Responses on “Bicycle Destinations”**

The Master Plan Survey asked respondents to name where they want to travel to on a bicycle. A majority named downtown, city parks, Hines Drive, and Old Village as destinations. Other destinations include neighboring communities like Livonia, Northville, Plymouth Township and Canton Township.
Surrounding Communities
The communities surrounding the City of Plymouth have planned for improvements to their transportation networks, particularly for pedestrian and bicycle users (or "non-motorized" transportation facilities). Since transportation networks help people get around their own community, as well as help people move between communities and beyond, the following describes how the region and neighboring communities are planning for future non-motorized transportation facilities. Knowing these goals will allow Plymouth to collaborate with neighboring municipalities, and efficiently coordinate mutually-beneficial non-motorized projects with its neighbors.

Southeast Michigan
On a regional scale, the Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG) has developed the Bicycle and Pedestrian Travel Plan for Southeast Michigan (2014) in conjunction with the Michigan Department of Transportation. SEMCOG is the regional planning organization for southeast Michigan. The 2014 Plan identifies existing and planned non-motorized facilities in the seven-county region, and identifies opportunities for filling in the gaps. The illustration below shows how the City of Plymouth's facilities are coordinated with the regional trail system. The regional corridor is shown in yellow, while red denotes gaps in the system. The plan suggests bicycle routes along West Ann Arbor Trail to South Main Street, and Main Street to Plymouth Road. The entire document is available on SEMCOG's website at http://semcog.org/Bicycle-and-Pedestrian-Travel.

Plymouth Township
The City of Plymouth is completely surrounded by Plymouth Township. The Township has addressed transportation in their most recent Master Plan. While they don't have jurisdiction over their roadway system, they do strive to work with Wayne County, the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), and SEMCOG.
Northville Township
Northville Township is planning to build off-road pathways along most of its major road arteries. In the vicinity of the City of Northville, the Township’s 2012 pathway plan includes planned pathways along both Eight and Seven Mile Roads as well as Northville Road, which link to the City of Northville. The Sheldon Road pathway was just completed recently and provides pedestrians and bicyclists a connection from the City of Northville to Five Mile Road and south to the City of Plymouth.

City of Northville
The City of Northville’s Non-Motorized Plan, adopted in 2014, articulates a system of pedestrian and bicycle facilities throughout the city. Similar to Plymouth, Northville has a well-established network of sidewalks. This plan proposes to address sidewalk gaps, and add new bicycle routes for short-term and long-term implementation. For Plymouth residents, Northville’s downtown is a destination that is accessible by bicycle or sidewalks along Sheldon Road and Hines Park Pathway.

Existing Policies
Plymouth has adopted policies regarding street and sidewalk maintenance and repairs. (Note that A few streets in the City of Plymouth are County or State roads, including Mill Street, Sheldon Road, Ann Arbor Road and Plymouth Road. These roads are maintained by Wayne County.)

Streets
In 1995, the City completed a comprehensive Capital Improvement Street Inventory to provide a long-range guide for the planning and scheduling of the reconstruction of City streets. The study analyzed 32 miles of City streets in terms of their condition, and when reconstruction would probably be needed with normal maintenance. As of 2006, the City had reconstructed approximately 13 miles of streets. Eight and one-half miles of City streets constructed of concrete either didn’t need repair, or could be repaired through the City’s concrete patch program. Of the remaining 10.5 miles of road needing repair, a second, 10-year phase of the street construction program was initiated, and was completed in 2016. Future street policies will be considered by the City Commission, Municipal Services, and the Street Administrator.
Sidewalks
The sidewalk program is implemented by the Department of Municipal Services. They inspect a different quadrant of the city each year and determine repairs based on criteria, reviewed and enacted by the City Commission.

Primary & Secondary Transportation Routes
Plymouth's vehicular system is well-established. Therefore, improvements to the City's transportation network in this Plan focus on ensuring the City is also walkable and bikable. Figure 12 on the next page depicts the priority routes and connections for Plymouth identified through a workshop with the Planning Commission Master Plan Sub-Committee. While all of these routes currently have existing sidewalks, there are opportunities to improve certain walks, as well as a need to establish facilities that better accommodate bicycle travel.

The map also shows secondary routes that should also be considered for improvements once the primary routes have been improved, or if the primary routes are ruled-out after further study by transportation professionals. The map represents a long-term vision and is intended to serve as a guide for future funding, design, and implementation, either independently or as a consideration of future street improvement projects.

1. Primary Vehicular Routes, colored in yellow, include Main Street, Starkweather Street, Harvey, Farmer, Penniman, and Ann Arbor Trail. These roadways have been identified as the main routes used by vehicles to reach various destinations in town, or to connect with the larger roadway system surrounding the City. (Note that the existing conditions on Penniman (i.e., retaining walls and narrow travel lanes) make this street unfavorable as a future bicycle route.) The information is provided on this map to provide context, identifying the major roads where vehicular traffic has priority.

2. Primary Bicycle Routes, colored in blue, are the routes selected for consideration for future bicycle amenities. These routes would allow bicycle access to most of the City's destinations, as well as connection to the Hines Park Trail, and regional bicycle network.

3. Primary Pedestrian Routes, colored in red, were selected to coordinate with new bicycle amenities and provide safe pedestrian travel along Main Street and around downtown Plymouth.

Goals for Non-Motorized Improvements
The Primary and Secondary Transportation Routes map illustrates the following goals for future pedestrian and bicycle improvements throughout Plymouth. These goals are provided to guide decision-making when resources are available. For example, if improvements are noted on the Primary and Secondary Transportation Routes map within the boundary of a major road project, or if a goal could be accomplished as a component of a major road project, the City Commission could consider adding one or more non-motorized transportation features to the project if funds allow. These goals are also provided to identify potential grant-funded projects.

1. Create a comprehensive non-motorized plan incorporating public input and technical expertise.

2. Provide a clear bicycle connection between Ann Arbor Road and Hines Drive through downtown Plymouth.
3. Create a bicycle network that connects the residential neighborhoods with schools, parks and downtown Plymouth, including the Plymouth library and the Plymouth Arts and Recreation Complex (PARC). This system should create a loop through the neighborhoods.

4. Improve sidewalks to eliminate any existing obstructions, add landscape buffers/street trees between walks and abutting streets, and widen walks to provide safer, more comfortable pedestrian travel ways. Opportunities for improvements are identified with capital letters on Figure 12, and are described under the “Notes” heading on the map legend.

5. Study and improve pedestrian crossings at the following intersections:

   a. Starkweather and Farmer
   b. Main St. and Church
   c. Main St. and Fralick
   d. Main St. and Wing
   e. Main St. and Burroughs
   f. Harvey and Penniman
   g. Harvey and Wing

6. Explore funding options for future expansion of the pedestrian path along Tonquish Creek between Evergreen and Sheldon Road.

**Non-Motorized Best Practices**

Six non-motorized best practices have been identified as desirable in the City of Plymouth. It is recommended that these best practices are implemented in appropriate areas throughout the city as determined by transportation professionals and citizen input.

1. Sidewalks

   Sidewalks are for pedestrians and are located within road rights-of-way. They consist of concrete pavement and are separated from the roadway by a landscape strip or buffer area. Ideally, a buffer of 5 to 6 feet is preferred, which is a width that can accommodate healthy growth of street trees. In Plymouth, older existing sidewalks are between 3.3 and 5.5 feet wide. Any new sidewalk construction must comply with current ADA standards which require a 5-foot minimum width as well as ramps at roadway intersections. City sidewalks could be widened depending on the number of pedestrians who are expected to use the sidewalk at a given time. Generally, recommended widths for sidewalks are:

   - 5 feet on local residential streets
   - 8 to 12 feet in downtown

2. Pedestrian Refuge Islands

   Refuge islands improve the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists crossing streets. These islands are generally raised or curbed longitudinal spaces placed mid-block, between street intersections. Refuge islands separate opposing lanes of traffic, reduce pedestrian crossing distances, act as a traffic calming feature, and increase the visibility of the crosswalk to motorists.

3. On-Street Shared Lane Markings

   Bicyclists sharing roadways with cars are appropriate for most roads having low daily volumes or speeds. Most local residential streets in Plymouth are currently suitable for shared roadway bicycling with no additional improvements necessary. Shared roadways are also appropriate on streets having higher traffic volumes and moderate speeds with provision of an increased shared lane width and/or shared lane markings. Shared roadways and
streets with shared lane markings are desirable in locations where the road right-of-way is limited or where it is not feasible to create a dedicated bike lane.

A “sharrow” is used to mark the shared lane. Sharrows are chevrons pointing in the direction of vehicle traffic to indicate where a bicyclist would ride. They provide a visual cue that bicycles are expected on the roadway and indicate the zone bicyclists should ride on. They are typically used on roadways where there is not enough space for bicycle lanes or which connect gaps between other bicycle facilities. Introduced in 2004, sharrows have been adopted by many cities across the U.S. and have been incorporated in the new editions of the federal Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) and the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) guidelines.

According to the Federal Highway Administration (2015), bicycle lanes are not appropriate on roadways having daily volumes that exceed 4,000 or car speeds that exceed 30 mph.

Where parking is permitted, bicycle lanes should always be placed between the parking lane and the motorized vehicle lane. The recommended lane width for this location is five to six feet. An important consideration in the design of bicycle lanes is the location of bicycle lanes at intersections. Guidance for pavement markings and signs at intersections is contained in the Michigan Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MMUTCD).

To accommodate bike lanes, Plymouth could pursue a “road diet,” which reduces the number of vehicle lanes and/or vehicle lane widths to accommodate space for bike lanes, as illustrated on the next page.
4. On-Street Bicycle Lanes

Bicycle lanes include designated lanes on roadways that incorporate striping, signing, and pavement markings for the preferential or exclusive use of bicyclists. They are one-way and a minimum of five feet wide. A minimum of three feet ridable surface should be provided where the joint between the gutter pan and pavement surface is smooth. If the joint is not smooth, four feet ridable surface should be provided. Similarly, bicycle lanes should be a minimum of four feet wide on streets without curbs.

According to the Federal Highway Administration (1994), bicycle lanes are appropriate on roadways having daily volumes that exceed 10,000 or car speeds that exceed 30 mph. Where parking is permitted, bicycle lanes should always be placed between the parking lane and the motorized vehicle lane. The recommended lane width for this location is five to six feet (AASHTO, 2012). An important consideration in the design of bicycle lanes is the location of bicycle lanes at intersections. Guidance for pavement markings and signs at intersections is contained in the Michigan Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MMUTCD).

To accommodate bike lanes, Plymouth could pursue a “road diet,” which reduces the number of vehicle lanes and/or vehicle lane widths to accommodate space for bike lanes, as illustrated below.

---

5. On-Road Paved Shoulders

A paved shoulder is the part of the roadway that is adjacent and contiguous to a regular vehicle travel lane without curb and gutter. Paved shoulders intended for bicycle use should be at least four feet wide. When motorist speeds exceed 35 mph, additional width is recommended. A 2-foot buffer adjacent to a bike lane or paved shoulder will provide greater distance between cars and bicyclists thereby increasing safety.

Plymouth has only a few roadways that are not constructed using curb and gutter, and they are under the jurisdiction of Wayne County. While the city does not control these roads, it could, if deems appropriate, communicate its desire for paved shoulders on these roads to the County as part of a future road project.

6. Other Bicycle Features

Providing amenities such as bike stations/rest areas along non-motorized routes can make the system more inviting to users. Basic amenities may include a bicycle rack, shade structure, benches, trash receptacle, and a water fountain. Additional amenities can include a dedicated bicycle rest area or bicycle repair station including an air pump, kiosk displaying a map of the area, sheltered bicycle rack, restrooms, shower and changing facilities, or bicycle lockers. A bike repair station currently exists on the north side of Plymouth’s public library.
CHAPTER 6
IMPLEMENTATION

The implementation chapter of the Master Plan ties the goals stated in Chapter 3 to actionable items. Without adequate implementation strategies, the vision of the Master Plan cannot be accomplished. There are a variety of tools that are available to help the Plan succeed. These tools are explained in more detail below.

City Strategic Plan

It is imperative that the Master Plan is implemented in conjunction with the City’s Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan aligns goals with funding priorities and project priorities. It is likely that priorities developed in this Master Plan will become a part of the one year tasks in future years. It is the responsibility of the Planning Commission, supported by Community Development staff, to ensure these tasks are vocalized to the City Commission and accomplished in an appropriate time frame. The City’s current Strategic Plan is discussed in more detail in Chapter 7, Background Studies.

Zoning Amendments

Zoning is the primary mechanism used to implement the visions and goals of the Master Plan. Zoning allows the City to achieve the desired land use patterns and quality development, as advocated in the Plan.

The current zoning districts and corresponding future land use categories are shown in the table on the next page (called a “Zoning Plan”). Note that the future land use categories do not entirely correspond with Plymouth’s current zoning districts. However, this comparison may indicate that future zoning district amendments are desired to fully implement the Master Plan vision.

Another area where zoning can assist in implementing the Master Plan vision is by researching and implementing modern-day zoning techniques. Plymouth is characterized by a mixture of uses in its commercial and business areas and residents enjoy being in close proximity to shops, restaurants, and services. This notion creates challenges for traditional zoning approaches that work to separate land uses. However, use of newly developed techniques, such as mixed-use zoning and form-based codes, could assist in creating the desired character in new developments.
Zoning Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Zoning</th>
<th>Future Land Use Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Single family Low Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1, Single Family Residential</td>
<td>Single-Family Medium Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT-1, Two Family Residential</td>
<td>Multi Family Low Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM-1, Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>Multi Family Medium Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM-2, Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>Multi Family High Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-1, Office-Service</td>
<td>Office Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-2, Office-Research</td>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1, Local Business</td>
<td>Local Business-Retail/Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2, Central Business</td>
<td>Central Business-Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-3, General Business</td>
<td>General Business-Retail/Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU, Mixed Use</td>
<td>Mixed Use Low Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC, Ann Arbor Road Corridor</td>
<td>General Business-Retail/Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-1, Light Industrial</td>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-2, Heavy Industrial</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-1, Parking</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUD, Planned Unit Development</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are specific parcels that should be rezoned in order for any proposed redevelopment to be consistent with the Master Plan, should the time come. As previously stated, development and change will occur with or without planning and it is the responsibility of the Planning Commission through the Master Plan to be proactive and anticipate future development. Rezoning can be initiated by the city or by the property owner, and the necessary steps laid out in the zoning ordinance must be followed.

The Planning Commission and City Commission should consider the following when reviewing rezoning and development proposals:

- Any rezoning or development proposal must be compatible with the Master Plan as a whole and be able to function on its own without harm to the quality of surrounding land uses.
- Any rezoning or development proposal should align with the City’s goals for development.

Form Based Codes

The original purpose of zoning was to prevent incompatible uses from moving into neighborhoods. Conventional zoning focuses first on regulating use. “Form based” codes seek to address this by focusing more on the “form” the building takes rather than just the use that occupies that building. Form-based codes can replace conventional zoning in downtowns and neighborhood centers, not simply to regulate form instead of use, but also to replace a system of uncertainty with one that offers predictability. By developing graphical standards and prescribing building form, the code can capture the intent of the City’s physical planning strategy. Areas that are appropriate for form based codes typically include commercial areas, such as Downtown or Old Village.
Capital Improvement Plan

The Capital Improvement Plan is the document within the City Budget that prioritizes high-cost public improvements such as streets, sewers, buildings, and parks. The schedule is based on the priorities for various needs and desires of the community, coordinated with the City’s ability to pay for them. The capital improvement program is a part of a dynamic planning process, which may change based on circumstances and availability of funding sources.

Capital improvement projects generally refer to the construction, expansion, or renovation of physical facilities that are relatively large, expensive, and permanent in nature. These projects can have a significant effect on the extent and direction of development depending on the type of capital improvement.

Statutory provisions require Planning Commission involvement in the development of the Capital Improvement Plan, but the Planning Commission has officially deferred responsibility of preparing the Capital Improvement Plan to the City Commission. A detailed listing of specific Capital Improvements is included in the City of Plymouth Annual Budget.

Funding Mechanisms

There are a variety of funding mechanisms that exist to accomplish expensive, larger scale projects outlined in this Plan. However, the City Commission and City Administration will have to determine the best funding mechanism that accomplishes the stated objective. The City currently uses a variety of funding mechanisms. These include Tax Increment Financing in the Downtown Development Authority area and Brownfield Redevelopment Act Financing. Other financing options are available, but should be deemed appropriate based on the project. Funding mechanisms currently not be using in the city that may be pursued include Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), Special Assessment, and Corridor Improvement Authority. Still other funding options are state and federal grant programs like those offered by the Department of Natural Resources, Department of Housing and Urban Development, or Michigan State Housing Development Authority.

Implementation Matrix

The implementation matrix on the following pages lists the tasks identified to carry out the desired goals and priorities set forth in the Master Plan. The matrix coordinates tasks with the various regulatory, capital improvement-related, and partnerships/programmatic/promotional goals of the City Commission’s Strategic Plan and assigns a time line, responsibility, and a possible funding source to each.

The time line used in the matrix includes the following categories:

- Continuing items should be regularly reviewed on an ongoing basis.
- Immediate priority items should be tackled within one year of the Master Plan’s adoption.
- Short-term items should be accomplished within three to four years of the adoption of the Plan.
- Mid-range actions should be accomplished within 5 to 7 years of the Plan’s adoption.
- Long-term actions should be tackled within 10 years.

Note that the tasks in the implementation matrix are not listed in order of priority.

The following abbreviations are used when denoting responsibility and funding:

Table 4: Organization and Department Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>City Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDD</td>
<td>Community Development Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDA</td>
<td>Downtown Development Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMS</td>
<td>Department of Municipal Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDC</td>
<td>Historic District Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDC</td>
<td>Michigan Economic Development Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>Recreation Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>Wayne County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Implementation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Priority Term</th>
<th>City Commission Goal</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regulatory and Policy Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment Ready Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a public participation strategy</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure clear definitions and requirements are included in necessary</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sections of the ordinance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review the Zoning Map annually, update if and as necessary</td>
<td>Cont.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align the zoning ordinance with the Master Plan goals</td>
<td>Mid.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and clarify special land use approval processes</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure industrial districts allow for compatible new economy-type</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow for non-traditional housing types in appropriate areas</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Design</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt clear, concise, enforceable ordinance requirements for land-</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scaping, signage, lighting, parking, and access management for Com-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mercial/Business districts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt standards that encourage shared parking access and locates</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parking behind buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt ordinance requirements that accommodate pedestrian activity</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within and around development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt flexible parking standards</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase residential densities in the appropriate areas</td>
<td>Mid.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor and encourage appropriate home sizing and massing</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research requirements that would promote housing options for life-</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time neighborhoods (i.e. ancillary dwelling units)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage environmentally sensitive/context sensitive and sustainable</td>
<td>Mid.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain and enhance the City’s tree canopy</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt standards that require low-impact development, sustainability,</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and energy-conservation practices (wind, solar, geothermal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt Complete Streets policies</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for vehicular needs, including parking</td>
<td>Mid.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve street mobility, connectivity, and safety</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a comprehensive non-motorized plan incorporating public input</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and technical expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Priority Term</td>
<td>City Commission Goal</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation (Continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a clear bicycle connection between Ann Arbor Road and Hines</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CDD, WC</td>
<td>CC, Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive through downtown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a bicycle network that connects neighborhoods with schools,</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>DMS, CDD</td>
<td>CC, Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parks, and downtown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve sidewalks to eliminate any existing obstructions</td>
<td>Mid.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>DMS</td>
<td>CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve sidewalks to add landscape buffers/street trees in the</td>
<td>Mid.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>DMS, CDD</td>
<td>CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>right-of-way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study and improve pedestrian crossings at downtown intersections</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>DDA</td>
<td>CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore funding options to expand the Tonquish Creek path beyond</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CDD, DMS, CC</td>
<td>Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen to Sheldon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and adopt design guidelines for the historic district</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research the appropriate location for a residential historic district</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td></td>
<td>HDC, CC</td>
<td>CDD, CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in historically-significant areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research the use of “form-based codes” and “overlay districts’ in</td>
<td>Mid.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>PC, CDD, CC</td>
<td>CDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the appropriate areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate colors used on Future Land Use and Zoning maps; create</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td></td>
<td>CDD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>map showing inconsistencies between these maps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review list of uses in all Zoning Districts. Research/add zoning</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td></td>
<td>PC, CDD</td>
<td>CDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>categories for “Parks/Open Space” and/or ”Institutional” uses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a unifying streetscape that connects South Main to downtown</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CDD, CC, DDA,</td>
<td>CC, Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and extends along North Main</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate funding to incorporate Complete Streets best practices into</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CC, DMS, CDD</td>
<td>CC, Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>street repaving and repair projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number of bike racks in downtown and Old Village</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td></td>
<td>DDA</td>
<td>DDA, Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnerships, Programs and Promotion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and coordinate efforts with other city plans</td>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CDD, RD, CC</td>
<td>CDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become a Redevelopment Ready Community through MEDC</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td></td>
<td>CDD, PC, CC</td>
<td>CDD, CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify priority redevelopment sites/transitional properties and</td>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>PC, CDD</td>
<td>CDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>determine desired future use and development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a clear vision for development outcomes and criteria for</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td></td>
<td>PC, CDD, CC</td>
<td>CDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>priority sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop an economic development strategy that connects the Master</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CDD, CC</td>
<td>CDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan and capital improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and coordinate efforts with regional economic development</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>MEDC, CDD, CC,</td>
<td>CDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WC, CC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote a welcoming environment for commercial business and</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CDD, CC, PC</td>
<td>CDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Master Plan Updates

The Master Plan should not become a static document. The Planning Commission should evaluate and update portions of the Plan on a periodic basis. The Planning Commission should set goals to review various sections of this Plan on an annual basis. The Master Plan should also be coordinated with the City’s Recreation Master Plan to provide proper, long range planning for recreation activities and improvements.
City of Plymouth Demographic Snapshot

Population
The 2010 U.S. Census reported the City of Plymouth’s population to total 9,132. However, 2016 population estimates from SEMCOG indicate that the population has increased to 9,415 persons, an increase of 1 percent. SEMCOG estimates indicate that by the year 2040 Plymouth’s population will decrease by approximately 1,000 people. Given the current demand for new housing units, specifically higher density developments, it seems unlikely that this will be the case.

The 2010 Census indicates that 43% of Plymouth’s population is between the ages of 35 and 64 which is the largest demographic percentage in the community as of 2010. SEMCOG forecasts that by 2035 the 35-64 year old age group will decrease in size to approximately 40 percent of the City’s population, while the 65 and older age group will increase to nearly 23 percent of the total population. The median age in the City of Plymouth as reported in the 2010 U.S. Census is 39.2 years.

Housing Stock
According to the 2010 U.S. Census data, there are 4,652 housing units within the City of Plymouth. Of the total housing units, 58 percent are detached single family residential homes. The 2010 Census reports that 59 percent of the housing units within the City of Plymouth were reported as owner-occupied.

Significant single-family residential construction has been taking place in the City for the last few years. This includes tear downs and rebuilds, additions onto existing homes, and remodeling projects. Downtown Plymouth is a destination and has been a driving force in the development and re-development of many single-family homes and parcels within walking distance of downtown, neighborhood parks, and schools. Additionally there has been significant growth in multi-family structures in the City in the form of high-end condominiums and apartments. It appears that the growth of multi-family developments may continue for the next several years.
Downtown
Downtown Plymouth is a regional recreational, commercial and business attraction. In addition, the housing growth in surrounding communities has increased the demand for leisure and entertainment activities associated with the City’s commercial centers.

The Downtown Development Authority was established in 1983 to facilitate business growth and development in the Downtown District. Projects include physical improvements to the streetscape as recently as 2010 as well as marketing strategies and event planning. The Downtown Development Authority is working to expand the current public parking supply as well as make improvements to Kellogg Park, specifically the fountain.

Library
The Dunning Hough Library located in Downtown contains over one million units (books, DVD materials, and compact discs), computer workstations, and Internet access. The library serves both the City of Plymouth and Plymouth Township, a population just over 36,000 as estimated by SEMCOG (July 2017). Likewise, since the library is located in the downtown area, it too is a gathering place for community organizations and a place to learn and study for local residents.

Senior Services
The Tonquish Creek Manor complex has 110 apartments and offers residents a cafeteria, work and recreation spaces, a garden and small park, and houses the local Meals on Wheels program.

The City of Plymouth, in partnership with Plymouth Township, offers the Senior Transportation program which provides transportation for the City’s senior population to and from doctor appointments, physical therapy, grocery shopping, and recreational opportunities.

The Finder’s Keepers’ Program managed by the staff at the Plymouth Housing Authority is a Section 8 housing program that assists resident seniors and/or handicapped persons with rent subsidies. The catchment area for this program is approximately a 10 mile radius with 30 units located in the City proper. This program has a waiting list of 2000 people at this time. The housing demand for senior citizens and people with disabilities is clearly high and the City may wish to consider how to meet this demand through the use of zoning, planning and social service programs.

Police
An effective, efficient police force is one the most important services the city provides. Plymouth has had an extremely low rate of overall crime, (a measure comparing crime statistics of every community in Michigan) for as long as records have been kept. With its central location, almost every call taken by the Plymouth Police can be responded to in less than three minutes.

There are 16 full-time officers, including the Chief, working for the Police Department, located within the City Hall building on Main Street. The number of officers is consistent with national standards that suggest there should be at least one to 1.5 officers for every one thousand citizens. The department has a detective bureau with two detectives, has a crime prevention officer as well as a weigh master.

Fire Services
The City of Plymouth fire and emergency medical services are delivered via an intergovernmental agreement with the City of Northville. The City of Northville provides the City of Plymouth with approximately 25 paid-on-call firefighters/medical personnel. The City of Northville operates two fire stations in the City of Plymouth. A fire station is located at Plymouth City Hall and an additional fire station is located at the corner of Spring St. and N. Holbrook in Old Village. Despite being paid-on-call emergency response times are within national averages and standards. The City of Northville Fire Department has automatic mutual aid agreements with Plymouth Twp. as well as the City of Novi. Automatic mutual aid guarantees additional equipment and first responders between the communities for certain types of calls. These calls are typically structure fires, mass casualty incidents, or large scale evacuation efforts. Additionally, the City of Plymouth is in partnership with not-for-profit Huron Valley Ambulance to provide Advanced Life Support Medical Response as well as hospital transport services for residents of the City.

Department of Municipal Services (DMS)
The Department of Municipal Services provides a wide variety of services to residents, business
owners, and visitors. DMS employs 7 full-time laborers and relies on part-time and seasonal help. The duties of the laborers are numerous and often change with the seasons, while other services are provided year round.

Spring seasonal responsibilities include cleaning up debris and leaves in all parks and public properties, street sweeping city-wide, and prepping Kellogg Park for summer events by laying topsoil and grass seed. Summer duties include set up, staffing, and clean up of special events; rebuilding manhole structures and catch basins on city streets; overseeing infrastructure projects like new roads, water mains, or sewer mains; inspecting and repairing playground structures; and inspecting and overseeing sidewalk replacement. In the fall DMS completes bulk leaf pickup throughout the city and flushes, maintains, and winterizes all fire hydrants. During the winter, responsibilities include all those associated with snow and ice removal on public properties including city owned buildings and parking lots and city streets. Other winter duties include responding to emergency water main break repairs and frozen service lines.

Year round services include those such as the brush chipping program and cemetery operations. Other annual services are trash cart maintenance, tree trimming and maintenance, and street maintenance. Fleet maintenance is another year round project and includes repairs to all equipment and city owned vehicles.

Recreation
The City of Plymouth Recreation Department serves tots to seniors within the entire Plymouth community. There is a wide variety of programming that is offered including athletics, fitness classes, summer camps, and special events. Over 90 different programs are offered throughout the year.

Plymouth offers its citizens a variety of open space and recreational opportunities. Parks and open spaces are essential in developing physically and socially balanced children, while providing adults a place for constructive use of their leisure time. Open spaces maintained and served by a carefully conceived recreation plan are important components in maintaining Plymouth as a desirable place to live. (See page 58 in the Appendix for a list of parks and open spaces.)

In 1972, the Cultural Center, a multipurpose building used for skating, recreational classes, meetings, and events was constructed. This facility is heavily used for recreational and civic activities. In an effort to save money and be leaders in clean energy solutions, the City converted the Cultural Center building to geothermal power in 2010. This is the first geothermal powered ice rink in the State of Michigan.

Parks and Playgrounds
Together, the 17 City-owned parks total just over 22 acres, giving an average park size of 1.3 acres. An inventory and location of the City Parks is provided in the Appendix. With the exception of Massey Field and the Cultural Center, the parks owned by the City are small, neighborhood spaces that offer playground equipment, picnic benches and small open spaces. Massey Field and the Cultural Center offer more active recreation areas and activities such as tennis, softball, shuffle board, and indoor ice skating.

The Plymouth Gathering, adjacent to the Penn Theater, is used for community events, such as the numerous festivals and special events and Farmer’s Market.

As their names attest, individual parks have been sponsored by civic groups for more than ten years. The agreements between the groups and the City are informal in nature and usually cover maintenance and plantings. While the parks take the name of the sponsor group, the parks are City-owned and remain public.
Additional recreational lands within the City are owned by Wayne County. Almost 60 acres are contained in the Middle Rouge Parkway. The Parkway, over 2,000 acres, is a series of drives and bikeways that stretches from Northville to Dearborn. Besides offering areas for biking, football, baseball, tennis, golf, and skating, the Parkway has many areas set aside for wildlife and nature centers.

An additional 11 acres of recreational space is contained within the two existing public schools and old Central Middle School, now Plymouth Arts and Recreation Complex (PARC). While East Middle School and Smith Elementary School cater primarily to school activities, residents are allowed access to the walking track, softball fields, baseball field, volleyball courts, soccer fields, playground, and basketball hoops.

City Commission
The City Commission together with the City Administration developed a Strategic Plan in January 2017 to provide a five year vision for the City of Plymouth. The City Commission and City Administration revisited the plan in February 2018. This strategic planning and goal setting session produced four goal areas that resulted in key objectives and one year tasks. The City Commission and City Administration will evaluate the strategic plan annually in January in conjunction with a professional facilitator.
City Commission 2018 Strategic Plan

Table 6: City Commission 2018 Strategic Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL I with Key Objectives</th>
<th>QUALITY OF LIFE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neighborhoods Supported, Parks/Recreation Collaboration, Communication (Multi-Platform), Cleanliness, Events-Continue to Host</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL II with Key Objectives</th>
<th>FINANCIAL STABILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balanced Budgets, Revenue Issues, Partnerships, Legacy Costs, Contract Out for Services, HVA-Mechanics, Marketing What We Do Well</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL III with Key Objectives</th>
<th>ECONOMIC VITALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vibrant Downtown-Active-Brand, Community Development, Business-Friendly/Mix, Master Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL IV with Key Objectives</th>
<th>SERVICE INFRASTRUCTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staffing, Public Safety Flexibility: Police &amp; Fire, Website Design and Data Management, Continuous Infrastructure Improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Master Plan Survey Results - Key Points

The Master Plan survey was developed to gather resident’s opinions on how various areas of the City should develop in the future. It was made available on the City’s website from August 1 to 15, 2016, and received 1,035 responses. Of those, 901 are city residents, most of whom own/live in a single-family home. The survey questions and more detailed summary are provided in the Appendix.

Single-Family Residential Development
The first set of questions addressed resident’s opinions about new residential development occurring in the City, including both new single-family homes, and residential building additions. The key findings of these questions are as follows:

- New single-family homes (74.1%) are too big for the lot.
- Residential building additions were either the right size for the lot (48.3%) or too big for the lot (39.3%).

Regarding impacts of new residential construction on neighborhoods, respondents generally don’t like the loss of smaller homes, loss of large trees, little remaining greenspace, and limiting sun/air to smaller homes. They expressed the feeling that the rights of people constructing a new home seem to overshadow those of people living in an existing, smaller home. They also expressed concerns that young families won’t be able to afford to move to Plymouth, and that the city should strive to maintain a balanced mix of housing types and sizes.

Comments in support of new home construction (8.0%), stated that new homes enhance property values of all homeowners in the city, modernizing the city, assisting in maintaining a thriving downtown, and property owners should be able to build to the extent allowed.

Seventy-four percent (74%) of respondents stated that they would support an additional or expanded historic district in the city and 13.6% stated that they would not. Hough Park and residential areas of Old Village were identified as specific areas where new historic districts could be considered.

Multi-Family Residential Development
The next set of questions asked residents about the type and location of housing for people in different life stages that may or may not necessarily live in a single-family home, such as young adults, renters/
roommates, young families, empty nesters and seniors. Respondents repeated that a balanced mix of housing types should be provided, although high rises were considered incompatible with the city’s character. Possible locations for new multi-family housing could be in or near Old Village, near downtown, and along main roads such as Mill, Main, Starkweather or Ann Arbor Trail.

**Downtown Development**

Survey questions regarding the downtown focused on desirable building characteristics, pedestrian amenities, and parking. Key responses regarding character included preservation of historic structures (77.4%), and allowing mixed uses (60.6%) in the downtown. Also, the character of new development should coordinate with existing buildings. Regarding pedestrian amenities, sidewalks (85.5%), street lights (77.3%), crosswalks (76.9%), crossing signals (66.7%), benches (63.9%), and street trees (61.5%) were most important to respondents. Improvements could include bike racks, and more drinking fountains and street trees. Most thought that additional parking should be created behind the library/gathering area, or on the existing structure. Regarding parking meters, most respondents were not in favor of this change due to negative impacts on local businesses.

**Old Village Development**

Questions that were asked about downtown were also asked about development in Old Village regarding desirable building characteristics and pedestrian amenities. And like downtown, respondents valued preservation and re-use of historic buildings in Old Village (64.7%) as the most important characteristic of this part of the city. In general, respondents think that Old Village has great potential. It has an independent character, unique businesses and creative events. Residents think that any changes should make it more of a destination than it already is, possibly by adding a central gathering place for events, streetscape project to give this area a face lift, and some type of connection with downtown (shuttle bus, bike lanes, etc.). Regarding pedestrian amenities, crosswalks/pedestrian signals should be added at key intersections to help pedestrians walk to Old Village from residential areas of Plymouth.

**South Main Street Development**

The next section of the survey asked about desirable building and site characteristics if the South Main Street area (between Wing St. and Ann Arbor Road) were redeveloped. Many thought that this area could use some work to eliminate the suburban “strip mall” pattern and add new developments that were more consistent with Plymouth’s downtown. For example, properties should locate parking lots behind the buildings (62.9%), and driveways and parking areas should be shared between buildings (47.9%). Additionally, buildings should be setback from the street the same/similar distance (47.1%), and should be mixed use (43.4%), including first floor retail, second floor office and third floor residential. Streetscape improvements, including added pedestrian amenities, were also suggested. Lastly, the entry into Plymouth at Ann Arbor Road could be redeveloped so that it blends in better with the downtown. This is Plymouth’s “front door,” and it should reflect the community’s character.

**North Main Street Development**

The survey asked the same question about North Main Street as it did about South Main Street. The area being considered in this question is between Church Street and N. Mill Street. A majority of respondents listed parking at the rear of buildings (51.3%), setting buildings back from the street at a similar distance (40.7%), and sharing driveways and parking areas between buildings (39.3%) are the most important for future development. Many respondents stated that the existing strip malls seem to have trouble maintaining businesses, and that both could be redeveloped in a way that is more appealing and consistent with the downtown. Streetscape improvements and pedestrian friendly amenities were suggested in order to make North Main Street an extention to the downtown area.
**Bicycle Amenities**

Questions about types of bike lanes, designated routes and preferred destinations were also included in the survey. Forty-four percent (44%) wanted to see pavement markings for dedicated bicycle lanes, 36% wanted roadway signage indicating bicycle routes, and 31% wanted pavement markings indicating shared vehicle/bicycle use of road lanes. Favored bike routes included Ann Arbor Trail (30.8%), North Harvey (28.6%), and South Harvey (27.7%). Twenty-seven percent of respondents didn’t think bicycle routes should be added to any of Plymouth’s streets due to safety issues. Lastly, destinations where people want to visit by bicycle include downtown (67.6%), city parks (60.1%), Hines Drive (57.5%) and Old Village (50.3%).

Many comments stated that more bike racks are needed downtown, and in city parks. Two connections that are specifically mentioned are with Hines Drive and the I-275 bicycle path. These routes should be studied and appropriate amenities added to create this connection.

**Sidewalk/Crosswalk Improvements**

Respondents listed a number of intersections that needed either a crosswalk, crosswalk signal or improvements to crosswalk signals (see Appendix for more detail). Regarding the condition of sidewalks, most thought they were kept in good repair. One noticeable exception are the sidewalks on the west side of S. Main St. where tree roots have heaved the sidewalk. Old Village sidewalks were also mentioned by several respondents as needing attention. A few people also identified the sidewalk on the west side of Harvey Street as being too narrow and close to the road. More separation between the sidewalk and street would be beneficial.

**Street Trees**

The survey ends with a question about the street tree program, street trees in general, and an opportunity to leave a comment on this topic. Forty-eight percent (48%) of respondents are aware that the city has a Street Tree Program, and 40% were not aware of the program, indicating additional education and marketing may be necessary. Several respondents suggested that incentives could be offered to plant trees on private property, and that native trees be added to the list of trees available through the program because of their adaptability to local conditions.

Regarding street trees, respondents stated that more trees within road right-of-ways and on public property should be preserved, planted and/or replaced because of the benefits trees offer residents, such as protecting property values and ensuring environmental advantages of trees. Others commented that greater enforcement of tree and shrub trimming along sidewalks was needed so they are not blocked.

Regarding trees near the downtown, several suggested that more trees in sufficiently-sized parking lot islands could improve the appearance of parking lots near the downtown significantly.

In the comments provided for this topic, many respondents voiced concerns about trees being removed for new residential construction. These respondents think that mature trees are a defining neighborhood characteristic, and suggested there should be a replacement requirement for trees removed for new construction. They also suggested the city provide incentives and/or requirements to protect trees with large diameters during construction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park/Open Space</th>
<th>Size in Acres</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Center</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>Multi-purpose recreational facility that includes NHL-sized ice skating rink, meeting and banquet rooms, full kitchen facility, lounge areas, indoor bathrooms, vending machines, outdoor picnic tables, outdoor benches, outdoor shuffleboard, and bike rack.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Massey Field</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>Softball/baseball field with a two-story press box building, batting cage, bleachers, covered dugouts, electronic scoreboard, outdoor lighting, and drinking fountain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairground Park</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>Sand volleyball court, concrete play surface with basketball hoop, playground, non-regulation sized baseball field, soccer field, small sledding hill, and picnic tables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lion’s Club Park</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>Natural areas, large picnic shelter, playground equipment, grills, swing sets, and outdoor lighting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hough Park</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>Natural area and open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary Park</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>Open space, picnic shelter, and playground equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Club Park</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>Softball field for ages 12 and under, mini soccer field with two goals, playground, and picnic shelter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starkweather Park</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Gazebo and picnic area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knights of Columbus Park</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Two playgrounds and picnic shelter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiwanis Park</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>Softball field for ages 12 and under, mini soccer field, pavilion, and playground equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellogg Park</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>Central community gathering place and landscaped area, large decorative fountain, drinking fountains, and benches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith Park</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>Picnic shelter and playground equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pointe Park</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>Landscaped area, flagpole, benches, and walkway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caster Park</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>Gazebo, benches and walkway to Starkweather Lofts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Wilcox Park</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>Picnic shelter, two play structures, grill, and drinking fountain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonquish Creek</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>Nature walk along stream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran’s Memorial Park</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>War memorials, benches, and landscaped area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>