



VILLAGE OF SUTTONS BAY

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE


420 N Front St.

Suttons Bay, MI 49682

Monday May 8, 2023 at 8:30 am

AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Additions / Deletions to the Agenda
3. Reports / Communication
4. Public Comments (*Please limit remarks to no more than three (3) minutes or less*).
5. Master Plan – Review of Comments
6. Public Comments/Written Communication
7. Committee Member Comments
8. Announcements
9. Adjourn

		VILLAGE OF SUTTONS BAY	
		REPORT VSB -2023-27	
Prepared:	May 4, 2023	Pages:	1 of 1
Meeting:	May 8, 2023	Attachments:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Subject:	Master Plan Comments / Discussion		

PURPOSE

To review the comments associated with the Master Plan review period.

OVERVIEW

The Planning Commission with the assistance of a professional planning firm Giffels Webster has provided a Master Plan for consideration to the Village Council. The comment period is now complete and the village council is tasked with reviewing the document to ensure it reflects the desires of the community. Following review of any comments, the community survey and future land use map, the village council should then consider one of the following:

1. Set a public hearing on the plan as presented.
2. Create a list of concerns to send back to the Planning Commission regarding the plan.
3. Meet with the Planning Commission to discuss the plan.

It is important to understand that the planning commission has spent a tremendous amount of time on the plan and should be applauded for their efforts. Fielding questions and possible direction on the plan, if that occurs, should not be viewed as a negative, rather the village council is the legislative body that is charged with approving the plan and should understand if/why any major changes are being proposed.

Please review the documents attached so we can discuss any specific concerns or questions you may have. We can then discuss the choices above (1-3) and move forward accordingly.

RECOMMENDATION

Discussion.

Public Input

Public input is essential in the Master Plan process as it ensures that the community's vision and needs are being directly addressed.

Online Community Survey

Residents and business owners were asked to complete a community survey so the Village could better understand the community's needs and objectives. The survey questions were formulated with the Planning Commission's guidance at multiple meetings. **Appendix __** contains a complete list of survey questions and results.

The online survey was launched on June 30, 2022, and remained open for feedback through July 18, 2022. The survey was promoted on the Village's website and e-newsletter. Postcards were distributed in the mail to all Village residents with a link to the survey and a flyer was posted in the Village Hall.

215 responses were received, but each question averaged roughly 175 responses, with fewer respondents (about 150) answering household demographic questions, which were directed towards residents.

Generally, people are concerned about access to the internet, pedestrian safety on Village streets, and affordability of housing. Of lesser concern are access to businesses in the winter, a lack of year-round residents to support businesses, poor upkeep of homes and yards, and lack of tourists in winter months to support businesses. Other points of agreement:

- Zoning should encourage the redevelopment and reuse of outdated commercial and industrial buildings within the Village.
- The Village should continue implementing sustainability and resiliency measures.
- Pedestrian walkways should connect our parks and residential districts.
- Business owners would also like to see the Village encourage public art.

There is significant opposition by all respondents to the ideas that the Village should consider installing a commercial dock at North Park to cater to commercial cruise lines and boat tours or allow marijuana retail stores to operate within the Village; however, both statements garnered answers of "not sure" as well, so additional education and discussion on those topics may be warranted.

The summary of responses to specific topics follows.

Housing

Long-term housing (more than 30 days), single-family housing within neighborhoods, and workforce housing are identified as priorities.

Multiple-family housing with more than five units and short-term housing (less than 30 days) are lowest priority for both residents and business owners who answered the question.



Village amenities

- Protection of Village wetlands, adding new public bathrooms, and improving the park system are high priorities.
- Despite improving the park system being identified as a high priority, creating small “pocket” or mini parks is not as important to respondents.
- Improving boating facilities and installing a fish cleaning station were considered not important.
- Business owners also prioritize adding new public bathrooms and improving pedestrian circulation and value creating smaller pocket parks—in fact slightly more than improving the park system.

Downtown streetscape

People seem to be open to installing trees downtown and installing crosswalks to make crossing the street safer and easier, but are not as convinced that adding street furniture, winter features, or streetlights are important.

Businesses

- Business property owners are undecided about willingness to pay a tax or assessment to finance the construction and maintenance of public bathrooms in the Village despite it being a priority. 28% answered “yes,” 26% answered “no,” and 34% answered “not sure.”
- Food trucks are currently prohibited in the Village. Few (5%) want to see food trucks throughout the Village, but most people are willing to see the Village allow them in certain areas (62.5%, designated areas or in Village parks combined) or only during special events, such as the arts festival (41.48%). Residents and business owners' results produce similar breakdowns.

Workforce housing

The following strategies were most popular among respondents:

- Expand zoning provisions to districts that do not currently allow residential housing.
- Allow single-room (long-term) rentals in single-family homes.
- Create a program to encourage workers to board with host families.
- Business owners were less open to a host family program, but more interested in tiny home or cottage developments.

Unpopular strategies were allowing for more density in the form of dormitory-style housing or allowing three- to four-unit homes in single-family districts, or to waive or discount water and sewer services for workforce housing. Residents and business owners would pay an additional charge to offset these costs.

Short term rentals

- The majority of respondents (71%) believe that short term rentals decrease the availability of houses for longer term residents while 61% said that short term renters are more likely to be disruptive to their neighbors.
- And yet, 74% of respondents believe that short term rentals support the Village's tourism economy and businesses and 65% agree that the Village should continue to allow short term rentals for up to 30 days.
- Several comments indicate that short term rentals should be capped or restricted to accessory dwellings.
- Business owners showed less disagreement to the notion that short terms rentals support the Village's tourism economy.

Additional comments were largely focused on short term rentals and affordable housing as well as traffic, trees, and parking were also issues that were mentioned frequently.

About the respondents

- Nearly all residents who responded are homeowners (98% of 136 responses) who have lived in the Village an average of 16 years.
- They are generally unlikely to sell their homes within the next year (93% of residents who answered the question) and prioritize the Village life, safety, and the family friendliness of the community.
- Resident responses show that residents are typically living in the Village during the summer months (roughly 96%) with a peak of 98.5% living in the Village in the month of July.
- Other months of the year have fewer residents living in the Village, with February having 74% of residents choosing to stay in the Village.
- Most residents do a significant amount of in-person shopping for goods and services in the Village when it comes to groceries, entertainment, and recreation (roughly 80%).
- They are less likely to go elsewhere in Leelanau County for groceries (23%) and entertainment (50%) compared to Traverse City (70% and 58%, respectively), but more likely to go to the county for recreation (68% vs. 36% who stay in the Village).
- Over half (53%) of residents make online purchases at least once a week, while another 33% make online purchases at least once per month.



MASTER PLAN REVIEW

PC09-2023-43 Suttons Bay Village

Reviewing Entity: Leelanau County Planning Commission
Date of Review: April 25, 2023

Section 1: General Information

Date Request Received: March 3, 2023
Last Day of Review Period: May 7, 2023.

Requested Action: Review and comment on the proposed Suttons Bay Village Master Plan. The draft plan is online at:
https://www.suttonsbayvillage.org/downloads/2023_03_03_village_of_suttons_bay_master_plan_draft_for_distribution.pdf

Applicant: Suttons Bay Village Planning Commission

Section 2: Suttons Bay Village Action

Planning and Zoning

The Village has been working on this Plan for some time and conducted a survey in 2022 to gather input from citizens. Appendix B contains a copy of the Community Survey. Appendix A contains the Community Profile, Appendix C contains the MEDC Preservation Case Studies, and Appendix D is the Glossary & list of Acronyms. At a Special Meeting held January 25, 2023, the **Village Planning Commission passed a motion to forward the Master Plan draft to the Village Council for review with the changes discussed at the Jan. 25 meeting. The motion passed 5-0.**

At the February 21, 2023 meeting of the Village Council, **it was moved by Lutke, seconded by Yoder, to allow staff to distribute the final draft of the 2023 Village of Suttons Bay Master Plan for a 63-day review as required by the Michigan Planning Enabling Act. Motion carried 7-0.**

Section 3: Basis for Plan Review

Section 41 of the Michigan Planning Enabling Act (MPEA) (PA 33 of 2008, as amended), requires a copy of a Plan or extension, addition, revision or other amendment of a Plan to be submitted to the county planning commission for review and comment. The review period for a Plan is 63 days.

Section 41.

3. If the county planning commission or the county board of commissioners that receives a copy of a proposed master plan under subsection (2)(e) submits comments, the comments shall include, but need not be limited to, both of the following, as applicable:

- (a) A statement whether the county planning commission or county board of commissioners considers the proposed master plan to be inconsistent with the master plan of any municipality or region described in subsection (2)(a) or (d).
- (b) If the county has a county master plan, a statement whether the county planning commission considers the proposed master plan to be inconsistent with the county master plan.

(4) The statements provided for in subsection (3)(a) and (b) are advisory only.

Section 4: Analysis

The Principal Goal of the Leelanau General Plan is to establish a strategy for meaningful growth that protects, and where possible, enhances the unique character and quality of life by focusing on the balance of environmental protection, resource management and economic development so as to provide a foundation for a sustainable economy that permits long term prosperity for all present and future Leelanau County residents. The proposed Plan has been reviewed for consistency with these policies.

A. Intergovernmental and Regional Context

A partnership founded on mutual respect and mutual support in achievement of the common goals of the General Plan should guide the development and implementation of new relationships between the County and local units of government in the County and between the County and adjoining counties in the region.

1. Does the proposed Plan strive for greater cooperation between neighboring units of government?
Yes.

B. Preservation of County Character

The existing natural and people-made features in the county that make up its rural character are interdependent with the activities that comprise its economic base. It is important therefore, that future land use change in the County enhance, not undermine, the character of the area around it, and in so doing contribute to protection of the unique rural character of the entire County.

1. Does the proposed Plan include strategies for the preservation of rural and small-town character?
Yes. The Plan (page 27) includes a Goal and objectives for Community Identity.

C. Working with Nature

Extensive and diverse sensitive natural features found throughout the County provide the foundation for the present and the future quality of life in the County. They should be protected where pristine, restored where damaged, and have access and use managed for long term sustainability.

1. Does the proposed Plan include strategies for environmental protection, restoration, and management?
Yes. Page 24 of the Plan outlines a Goal and Objectives for Natural Resources.

D. Balanced Growth

Local land use or comprehensive plans and local development regulations should be updated and thereafter maintained to include goals, objectives, policies and strategies for managed future growth consistent with the Leelanau General Plan. Local plans should include more specific land use and density proposals at the parcel specific level. Local regulations should focus on design and other issues of local significance. Public facilities should all be constructed according to local capital improvement programs that are coordinated at all governmental levels.

1. Does the proposed Plan include parcel-specific future land use recommendations (map)?
Yes. The Plan outlines several different designations and includes these on the Future land Use Map (page 31). These designations allow for different types of development, and densities within the Village.

Section 5: Staff Comments

A Master Plan is the vision of how a community will develop over time, providing guidance regarding how areas should be zoned, and standards that should be incorporated into the Zoning Ordinance.

NEW BUSINESS ITEM 2

At least every 5 years after adoption of a master plan, a planning commission shall review the master plan and determine whether to commence the procedure to amend the master plan or adopt a new master plan. The review and its findings shall be recorded in the minutes of the relevant meeting or meetings of the planning commission. This doesn't require a local municipality to do an update every five (5) years, but it does require a review and then recording that decision in the minutes.

Section 43 of the MPEA states:

(3) Approval of the proposed master plan by the planning commission under subsection (2) is the final step for adoption of the master plan, unless the legislative body by resolution has asserted the right to approve or reject the master plan. In that case, after approval of the proposed master plan by the planning commission, the legislative body shall approve or reject the proposed master plan. A statement recording the legislative body's approval of the master plan, signed by the clerk of the legislative body, shall be included on the inside of the front or back cover of the master plan and, if the future land use map is a separate document from the text of the master plan, on the future land use map.

Staff is not aware if the Village has asserted its right to approve or reject the Master Plan under Section 43 of the MPEA. If the Village Council passes a resolution, then the final approval of the Plan will be taken by the Village Council. Otherwise, the planning commission has final approval.

The Plan is well organized, easy to read, and the use of charts, maps and photos provide a clear document. The Village has incorporated the items that are to be included in a Master Plan, as noted in the MPEA. They have also included a substantial amount of information on housing which could increase the type and variety of housing options offered in the Village. The Implementation section is done well and includes Action Items, who is responsible for the item, potential funding, time frame and potential partners. The Appendices include information which supports the actions outlined in the Plan.

Couple minor corrections:

Page 14, top of the page, last line, insert the word 'the' to read: "...connecting the village to the rest of the state".

Page 16, the 2nd paragraph under Online Community Survey notes that the feedback for the survey was through July 18, 2022, but the bottom line under the QR code states the survey would close on July 15.

Page 30, in the blue box at the top 'City' is mentioned when it should be 'Village'.

Page 32, end of first paragraph, change the word 'preserve' to 'preserves'.

Page 33, last paragraph, the Heritage Route Plan is titled "Leelanau Scenic Heritage Route Corridor Management Plan" (not Leland-and Leland is spelled wrong).

Page 35, this Map appears to be updated yet the date on the bottom says 'Map Produced June 2011'. Include a current date for the Map.

Section 41 of the MPEA states that the county planning commission shall include a statement whether they consider the proposed Master Plan to be inconsistent with the Master Plan of any municipality (within or contiguous to the local unit of government) or region, and whether they consider the proposed Master Plan to be inconsistent with the County General Plan.

A motion to that effect should be considered at the April 25 County Planning Commission meeting.

rcvd 4-18-23 9
emailed to VC + PC
on 4-18-23

Comments on the draft Suttons Bay Village Master Plan

I would suggest adding a Land Acknowledgement on page 3.

Executive Summary: I understand this is derived from the survey data but sometimes can seem directed by the way the questions were asked. Walkways does not always indicate a paved sidewalk as prescribed in the condos north of the village. Less trafficked areas can be narrow paved roads to slow traffic and be shared with pedestrian and bike traffic.

Future Land Use should include consideration of areas around the Village and not live in a vacuum.

Advocacy and communication seems to be lacking between recommendations of the planning commission and the village council. How can this be improved?

Page 13, goal 2: I strongly feel the lack of continuity of history. The back story on how we got here is getting lost.

Acquisition of Park Land: is there a defined area of interest and plan to move fast as property becomes available. Are funds set aside for this purpose?

DDA discussion in the second column: Is there an acceptance by the Village Council of use of TIF or would this hit a roadblock when actually applied?

I wonder if we have a defined limit on marina development and size? Is there a time for a shift from motorized / fossil fueled marine to non motorized boating and small boats (Look at the Center for Wooden Boats in Seattle)

p16 "continue implementing sustainability and resiliency measures". Does the Village have a statement/resolution on Sustainability like others? Like Traverse City, Holland MI, Charlevoix? Sustainability should be looking at Climate Change and moving to all electric energy.

p17 Housing. It always seems that the first view of affordable housing is a single family free standing house. Data shows that the average household size is 1.8. There should be a discussion of what types of housing are needed by intended users and affordable incomes. There is a disconnect with what is truly affordable workforce housing. Even housing for seniors looking to downsize into an easier to manage space. For example an employee making \$15 per hour and applying the 30% of income for rent, should be looking for a rental at \$750 to \$800 per month. Where are these in Suttons Bay? Studio and 1 bedroom units are needed to house employees for our restaurants, shops, grocery store...

Yes, progress to cap the STR units is great. Now we need to monitor and enforce STR.

p22 Reinforce the goal of providing a complete range of housing. Realize that availability of sewer and water allows for more density and better use of high value real estate. Spread the cost of the underlying land per unit of affordable housing.

p23 Acknowledges the need for the \$15 to \$20 wage earner housing. We need examples of form based multi unit housing - studio and 1 bedroom units in structures that look much like a larger footprint home with exterior finishes that fit into our neighborhoods.

p 23 Is the Stormwater Asset Management and Wastewater Report available on the web site?

p 25 Prepare for EVs should be part of the plan or resolution for sustainability and climate change.

p 26 Yes, training and staff that offers advice on issues; pro and con analysis to assist in decision making for PC and VC.

p27 Is there a list of what is considered a historic site? Consider the 15 minute community model and bike transportation is part of this.

Does anyone remember the zoning work done with consultants from MSU in the '80s. There was a suggestion to make Front Street 1 way north bound. Some of that has happened from M22 South to Dame street. St Mary's could be South bound. What would this do to traffic for pedestrians and bikes. Just something to think about as you all walk the Village.

p31 Is St Michael's property missing from this map?

p34 East of M22 between Broadway and 4th St. Is this a change, I don't understand.

Also, are you aware that Leo Creek is a Conservation Easement property?

p43 Housing. All good items to list for PC action but more training in zoning is needed and much more solid advisory staff is needed. There is a lack of communication on decisions made by the PC that are forwarded to the VC.

p44 There is not recognition of the Community Land Trust, Peninsula Housing as a tool in helping property development of affordable housing in perpetuity.

p48 Look back in history at the analysis of traffic patterns in my time on the PC, 1980s: Front Street was to be one way North and St Mary's 1 way South. Just at thought; would this slow traffic and make it safer for bikes and pedestrians?

p51 Capital Improvements of water and sewer infrastructure. What of the fund balance currently in this fund? There were funds available to purchase the athletic fields to assist the school - now paid back. From my records, the ready to serve and capital improvement charges on my sewer bill have not changed in the years I have received service (2015 to 2023). There should have been small % increases over the years to cover the expansion of the plant. If the Village feels that the capacity is all reserved for the defunct PUD, is it time for an expansion of the system? Is this a reasonable use of funds if the capacity is available now, just sitting waiting for the PUD to move?

p52 time for a historic walking tour?

p53 Where is the Visitors Center. The front area of the Village Hall is under used and could serve as well as offering year round bathrooms. Tax payers have funded this building to be used.

p 56 top of 2nd column, tribe should be tribal.

p57 1871: The Union Hotel opened. Now operated at the VI Grill; the oldest continually operating restaurant in Leelanau County.

1874: The Seimel Bay Hotel at the corner of Broadway and Lincoln Street. Included a livery for horses. The corner parking area was once the Village Department of Public Works and Fire Station until the current Fire Hall was built in 2004 at the corner of First and St Mary Street.

p71 Housing types: Has no one noticed the mobile home at the corner of Concord and St Marys Street

p74 Affordable workforce housing:

Leelanau County population is 22,301 and SB Township is 2270 or about 10.1% of the County. Using the 2019 needs analysis, we need 37 rentals and 30 homes in the Village/Township. We need 32 of those rental units at \$1,000 / month or less and 15 homes selling for \$250,000 or less in SB Township and Village. Or, someone making \$15/hour can afford \$750 - \$800 rent pre month. We need **Studio and 1 bedroom rentals - where are these permitted.**


Sewer and Water hook ups make it possible to build more density on property that is the first cost hurdle in affordable housing.

P76 Shoreline Residential: What is the scale of structures allowed? Are we accepting conversion of cottage scale to multi million dollar homes?

p80 I see that the Village Growth Area includes the area S of Herman Rd. yet the Village is not enabling sewer to expand for affordable housing development.

p83 I wonder if a change of name on the Coal Dock Park might be considered as burning coal has led us to the climate crisis? This dock was used by the Greilick Brothers when they operated the saw mill in the 1870's. And, it was a major dock for freight and passenger boats - commonly referred to at the Company Dock.

p85 Also, consider renaming Waterwheel Park to Gronseth Park. Lars Gronseth opened his shoe store in 1886 in the building at the corner of St Joseph and Jefferson Street. The building was the first in town to have electric lights.

		<h1 style="text-align: center;">VILLAGE OF SUTTONS BAY</h1> <h2 style="text-align: center;">REPORT VSB -2023-24</h2>	
Prepared:	April 27, 2023	Pages:	1 of 4
Meeting:	May 2, 2023	Attachments:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Subject:	Master Plan Review		

OVERVIEW

When reviewing the Master Plan, it is important to understand the structure of such a plan. One should read the text, review the survey and compare the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) changes to understand if they all work together to create the blueprint for the village's future. Staff will review these three items in brief as I believe the document is only a few changes from representing the Village *as a whole*.

Overall, the Master Plan is a good document. It is based on good planning principals, is an easy read with good flow and easy to understand. However, when taking all three elements into consideration, the document seems to lose its way and, in some aspects, directly contradicts the survey or recent Village Council decisions.

The zoning changes proposed in this master plan are ambitious for such a small community that relies on its small-town character to generate tourism and interest. So, understanding that this document will lead to several properties being rezoned, the likely expansion of high intensity auto-centric uses along the corridor and permit high density residential in arguably the most environmentally sensitive acreage in the Village, is paramount. If that's the direction the community wants to head then the FLUM and suggested rezonings will certainly accomplish this. Putting growth and tax base first, is common in communities and as proposed, it should not take long to see the effects of these changes.

To explain further, I will offer a few observations:

OBSERVATION: The Master Plan states;

- *"The General Commercial area has been consolidated with the former Mixed Use South category into a new Mixed Use South Gateway category for clarity and consistency to development" (Page 9).*
- Page 40 states; The Village does not intend to rezone properties at this time, but following the adoption of the Master Plan, the planning Commission may consider opportunities to combine the SB district with the SG district.

Combining the **South Gateway** and **South Business Districts** is a rather large departure from the growth patterns encouraged in the past. The uses permitted in these districts are very different. A brief review of these districts indicates that:

1. Neither the **South Gateway** or the **South Business district** currently lists multi-family housing as a permitted use.
2. The **South Gateway** allows single family, two -family and residential above commercial, so compatibility with single family homes was historically emphasized in neighborhoods when multi-family was not permitted.
3. The **South Business District** currently prohibits residential in favor of industry and warehousing.

VILLAGE COUNCIL

4. Nearly all current and active uses along the corridor are in transitioned single-family homes. This is typical for small communities attempting to keep the character of their community.
5. This change would permit high density residential in the **South Business District**, which currently prohibits all residential. This is a bit of a *change from generating taxbase* as these zoning districts are typically saved for job producing businesses, rather than the encouragement of residential.

COMMENT

From a taxbase perspective, by combining the above-mentioned districts, the corridor entrance will transition from an unusable wooded, natural corridor and transitional small homes, to allowing currently prohibited uses, such as gas stations, multi-family housing, warehousing etc. These changes will generate tremendous interest from investors in a very short period and result in an increase in taxbase out of several unusable acres. The Villages absence of adequate wetland and floodplain protections will be beneficial for property owners when requesting permits to fill this acreage from the State.

- Protection of Village wetlands is listed as a high priority (Page 17). This may need to be adjusted if there is support for combining these districts to allow previously prohibited & more intense uses in the **South Gateway** or the **South Business district**.
 - Either this statement should be adjusted to support the practice of filling sensitive areas OR the statement should be expanded to include floodplains and other sensitive areas.

OBSERVATION: **NORTH GATEWAY/PUD/SFWR**

1. The Master Plan FLUM encourages combining the North Gateway, **PUD District, and SFWR (LIMITED)**
 - a. The **PUD district** should remain as such considering a PUD, which required the rezoning of this property to “PUD” is in place. Litigation between owners and involving the Village is likely to occur in 2023. Changing this on the FLUM is premature and should not occur until the Courts render a decision on the PUD.
 - b. The **North Gateway** district from Grove Street to M-204 –Being that residential single family remains to be the primary use of these structures, the village may want to consider this area as an extension of the Central Residential neighborhood, rather than encouraging it to redevelop into commercial. This would preserve this area for future growth, when desired.
 - c. **Single Family Waterfront Residential – (north of condos)** There is a series of approximately 7-8 very small lots that are slated to be rezoned to mixed use to allow more intensive uses. These properties are small and should remain as SFWR.

OBSERVATION: **HOUSING & PAGE 43**

A housing action list (page 43) was included in the Master Plan. My experience over the years has allowed me to understand affordable housing projects from both sides of the counter. When done properly, with MSHDA funding, it is very profitable for the developer, and still provides true affordable housing for those in need.

VILLAGE COUNCIL

COMMENT

One clarification that should be acknowledged is the term “workforce housing.” This reference means the same thing as market rate housing, or any other term. Therefore, when a project is presented as such, and the deciding body believes they are approving a project that is going to limit rent or otherwise, that is not the case. They are both non-binding terms that fail to limit a developer in any way, therefore, once a project is approved, it is approved for the density, regardless of the rent.

The checklist is clearly drafted with good intentions in mind and we all understand the housing problems Leelanau/ Grand Traverse and others are faced with, and support the idea of a group bringing awareness to the issue. Although difficult to address, its inclusion in the plan, good intentions aside, expresses a housing strategy that does not accurately reflect a solution. One example, the local review process is the quickest and least expensive in a series of steps required to obtain project approval and funding, so I would question the emphasis on streamlining the process at the local level as a solution.

In addition, the checklist contradicts many aspects of the survey results and the desires of most village residents.

In brief, direct contradictions of the survey and checklist includes:

SURVEY:

- **Multiple-Family Housing with more than 5-units** and Short-Term Rentals are lowest priority for both residents and business owners who answered the question (Page 17/23).
- Unpopular strategies **were allowing for more density in the form of dormitory-style housing or allowing 3-4 unit homes in single family districts**, or to waive or discount water and sewer services for workforce housing. Residents and business....(Page 17)
- Consider allowing an additional ADU (one attached and one detached) on the same property. (See above) I would argue that would be a more intense use and therefore would not be supported either?

I would recommend the elimination of the checklist and appropriately place a goal and objective that meets the intent of the checklist, groups and individuals interested in in housing advocacy.

GOAL: To encourage the development of housing for all income levels and abilities.

OBJECTIVE: Work with applicants to achieve MSHDA funded projects.

This provides a balanced approach and provides everyone with a role in the process, including the Village Council, who would have a role in financial waivers.

OBSERVATION - Page 27 – Community Identity - Consider reading the objectives 1-9 below and relate it to the major changes identified above. Do these reflect or contradict the major changes listed?

Further minor observations include the following:

OBSERVATION - Page 23 –

- Consider Changing GOAL: Provide a range of housing....to *Encourage* a range of housing...The village doesn't build housing.

VILLAGE COUNCIL

- Consider changing Objective #2; - Address the need for workforce housing... Change to: *Encourage housing for all incomes and encourage fixed rental properties for service workers.*

Read the PUBLIC INPUT ON HOUSING – How does that translate to all the housing text in the Master Plan?

OBSERVATION - Page 24 –

#3. Protect wetlands – Consider adding floodplains & environmentally sensitive lands to this OR remove this in favor of combining SG & SB districts.

OBSERVATION - Page 26 –

Economic Development – Related data bullet point 1 - Consider eliminating the statement regarding utilities as it is not accurate.

OBSERVATION - Page 31 –

FLUM – Consider having the map reflect the property recently rezoned NVR, rather than mixed use.

CONCLUSION

The Master Plan is a good document that followed a good process, however as can be the case in small communities, the desire “to do good” sometimes gets distorted. The housing checklist is an example of this. This plan puts an unusual increased emphasis on housing that in some regard can be interpreted to conflict with the survey. This conflict is typically an indication that residents prefer the quality of life they have grown accustomed to. This in no way changes one’s desire to encourage housing for service employees or any other income level. In fact, communities in general rely upon adjacent communities for support with this issue due to a lesser land cost, less taxes, no infrastructure costs, and the location is comparable. One only needs to direct their attention to the Traverse City Housing Commission’s most recent partnership in Garfield Township, rather than in Traverse City.

Interestingly, if the FLUM was changed back, the SB & SG were left alone, and the checklist (page 43) was removed, the master plan reads virtually the same, it just doesn’t contradict the survey, recent decisions or itself. Good luck!