

# 5-year review of 2016 Master Plan

On July 1, 2021, the Planning Commission recommended that no amendments to the 2016 Master Plan were necessary at this time.

On July 12, 2021, the City Commission received the Planning Commission's recommendation and concurred that no amendments were necessary at this time.

The next 5-year scheduled review of the 2016 Master Plan is in 2026.



St. Joseph Planning Commission  
Commission Chambers  
700 Broad Street, St Joseph, MI 49085

**AGENDA**  
**July 1, 2021**  
**4:30 PM**

**Call to Order**

**Approval of May 6, 2021 Meeting Minutes**

1. Regular Minutes of Thursday, May 06, 2021
2. May 6, 2021 Redline meeting minutes

**Approval of June 3, 2021 Meeting Minutes**

1. Regular Minutes of Thursday, June 03, 2021

**New Business**

1. Public Hearing - City of St. Joseph - Amendment to Article IX Special Districts - Creation of Main Street Overlay District - Residential on the Ground Floor

**Old Business**

2. Chapter 25 Sign Ordinance Amendment - Address Numbers and Allowed Projection with Clearance
3. Chapter 25 Sign Ordinance Amendment - Modification for Wall Signs
4. 5-year review of 2016 Master Plan
5. Organization Meeting - Receive Nominating Committee Report and Recommendation for Chair and Vice Chair for 2021-2022 Term

**Public Comments**

**Commissioner Comments**

**Adjournment**

Minutes of the St. Joseph Planning Commission Meeting held Commission Chambers, 700 Broad Street, St Joseph, MI 49085 on July 1, 2021.

**Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 4:30 PM by Chair Patsy Hartzell

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Patsy Hartzell	Chair	Present	
Kathy Burczak	Member	Present	
Sean Ebbert	Commissioner	Absent	
Becky Rice	Commissioner	Present	
Ceile Wipper	Commissioner	Present	
Julee Laurent	Commissioner	Present	
Bridget Cook	Commissioner	Present	
Thaddeus Hackworth	Commissioner	Present	
Anthony Uhrick	Member	Present	
Kristen Gundersen	Community Development Director	Present	
Laurie Schmidt	City Attorney	Present	
Trudy Wilder	Building Inspector	Present	

**Approval of May 6, 2021 Meeting Minutes**

1. Regular Minutes of Thursday, May 06, 2021

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>ACCEPTED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Julee Laurent, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Becky Rice, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Chair Hartzell, Member Burczak, Commissioner Rice, Commissioner Wipper, Commissioner Laurent, Commissioner Cook, Commissioner Hackworth, Member Uhrick
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Commissioner Ebbert

2. May 6, 2021 Redline meeting minutes

**Approval of June 3, 2021 Meeting Minutes**

1. Regular Minutes of Thursday, June 03, 2021

Ms. Burczak requested changes to packet page 32 related to discussion on 914 Main Street.

Ms. Cook called out a typographical error on another page.

Chair Hartzell requested that staff review the Zoom recording and bring revised minutes back to the August meeting for review.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>TABLED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Julee Laurent, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Becky Rice, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Chair Hartzell, Member Burczak, Commissioner Rice, Commissioner Wipper, Commissioner Laurent, Commissioner Cook, Commissioner Hackworth, Member Uhrick
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Commissioner Ebbert

**New Business**

1. Public Hearing - City of St. Joseph - Amendment to Article IX Special Districts - Creation of Main Street Overlay District - Residential on the Ground Floor

Chair Hartzell opened the public hearing at 4:39 pm regarding a text amendment that the Planning Commission had been discussing for several months.

Jack Sanderson, owner of 616 Main Street expressed thanks to the staff for the work on the draft language that the Planning Commission has been able to review and believes that the draft has

The Commission concluded that they would like to continue the discussion to the August 5<sup>th</sup> meeting and to receive a draft ordinance which does not reference any change to the allowable wall sign modification percentage.

4. 5-year review of 2016 Master Plan

Chair Hartzell stated the Michigan Planning Enabling Act requires a five-year review of the adopted master plan.

Ms. Gundersen stated an informational handout created by the Michigan Municipal League (MML) asks four questions that should be reviewed to help determine if the adopted master plan needs to be updated.

Ms. Burczak asked if the reference to Lakeland Hospital should be updated due to the merger and name change.

Chair Hartzell stated she did not believe the master plan should be amended to address a business name change, the facility remains in the community.

Ms. Laurent stated maybe the reference could be made as part of the review.

Chair Hartzell questioned if notice to the surrounding communities was needed.

Ms. Gundersen stated no, unless it is determined the plan needs to be updated.

Ms. Wipper stated she concurs with the comments made by staff regarding why the master plan does not need to be updated at this time and how the document is being used.

Ms. Burczak moved to accept the five-year review of the 2016 Master Plan as required by the Michigan Planning Enable Act 33 of 2008 as no changes are necessary, based on review of the Michigan Municipal League (MML) informational handout and the staff memorandum dated July 1, 2021.

Ms. Wipper seconded the motion.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Kathy Burczak, Member
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Ceile Wipper, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Chair Hartzell, Member Burczak, Commissioner Rice, Commissioner Wipper, Commissioner Laurent, Commissioner Cook, Commissioner Hackworth, Member Uhrick
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Commissioner Ebbert

5. Organization Meeting - Receive Nominating Committee Report and Recommendation for Chair and Vice Chair for 2021-2022 Term

Ms. Laurent stated that Ms. Rice and Ms. Cook were members of the nominating committee and are recommending that Ms. Hartzell be the chair and Ms. Wipper by the vice chair for the 2021-2022 session.

Ms. Laurent made a motion to appoint Ms. Hartzell Chair of the Planning Commission and Ms. Wipper the Vice Chair for the 2021-2022 session.

Mr. Hackworth seconded the motion.

Chair Hartzell thanked the members for the appointment.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED [7 TO 1]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Julee Laurent, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Thaddeus Hackworth, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Chair Hartzell, Commissioner Rice, Commissioner Wipper, Commissioner Laurent, Commissioner Cook, Commissioner Hackworth, Member Uhrick
<b>NAYS:</b>	Member Burczak
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Commissioner Ebbert

**Public Comments**

None.

**Commissioner Comments**

None.

**Adjournment**

The meeting was closed at 6:36 PM

---

Presiding Officer

---

City Clerk/ Recording Secretary



# Agenda Item

**TO:** Planning Commission

**FROM:** Kristen Gundersen, Community Development Director

**RE:** 5-year review of 2016 Master Plan

**MEETING DATE:** July 1, 2021

In March and April of this year, staff forwarded information of adopted plans and a spreadsheet showing the progress on the Goals/Objectives and Tasks in the 2016 Master Plan for review. All members should have copies of the 2016 Master Plan, Downtown Vision Master Plan adopted in January 2020 and the Parks Plan 2021-2026 adopted in January 2021.

Typically, master plans are designed to look 20-years into the future to create a vision for the community. Changes are made to the document under several scenarios which can include a proposed project that does not comply with the future land use map or changes to existing conditions are taking place and make items within the adopted plan outdated or no longer necessary.

The Michigan Planning Enabling Act - Act 33 of 2008 requires that the Planning Commission shall review the master plan every five years to determine if the master plan needs to be amended or a new one adopted. The 2016 Master Plan was adopted in June 2016 and it is now time for the five year review. Attached is an informational handout prepared by the Michigan Municipal League (MML) providing information regarding the required Master Plan - Five Year Review.

Within the MML handout four questions are stated for consideration.

1. Have there been major changes in the community not anticipated in the current master plan? This could include events such as new utilities, major road improvements, or large development approvals among other things. *Looking back to the past five years, staff does not believe there have been any major changes in the community that were not anticipated in the master plan.*
2. Are there instances where the planning commission has departed from the master plan? Do the reasons for these departures demonstrate a need for an overall revision of the master plan? *Staff does not believe there have been any departures from the master plan. The few map amendments (rezonings) have taken place and have been in keeping with the master plan. Efforts have been made to make text amendments to the Zoning Ordinance as called out by the master plan and future ones are needed to address Redevelopment Ready Communities certification requirements.*
3. Are the goals and policies set out in the plan still relevant? An effective master plan will have a series of carefully crafted goals and policies describing the community's vision for its future. Is the community still willing to take the actions necessary to implement them? *Since the adoption of the 2016 Master Plan, the Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on the Downtown*

*Vision Master Plan which was adopted by the City Commission in January 2021. The City Commission also utilizes the 2016 Master Plan along with other adopted documents to help guide in decision making along with the adoption of the CIP.*

4. How does the future land use map and text compare with zoning actions taken since the plan was first adopted? Do the land use descriptions need to be revised to account for new development? This element contains the land use descriptions and map that depict specific land use arrangements. *The few map amendments (rezonings) that have taken place during the past five years have been in keeping with the adopted future land use map. Work continues on updating the Zoning Ordinance.*

City staff does not believe there are any conditions that would require an amendment to the 2016 Master Plan, as the overall intent of the plan remains and has been followed since adoption. After review and discussion if the Planning Commission concurs, a simple motion referencing review of the documents and the questions listed above were discussed and no additional changes are needed at this time.

The next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for August 5th.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- Michigan Municipal League - Fact Sheet - Master Plan 5 year review (PDF)

## Master Plan—Five-Year Review

### Introduction

The Michigan Legislature amended the Municipal Planning Act in 2002 to revise the legal processes necessary to adopt a new or amended master plan. Sometimes referred to as “The Coordinated Planning Act,” the amendment greatly expanded the notification process and the degree of involvement of the legislative body. In 2008, the Legislature combined the county, township, and city and village planning Acts into one Act: The Michigan Planning Enabling Act (MPEA). This Act retained the coordinated planning requirements of 2002. Municipalities wishing to begin work on a new master plan, or amend an existing plan, must follow this process. (See Fact Sheet entitled Updating the Master Plan—Mastering the Process). An additional provision of the MPEA (MCL 125.3845(2)) requires each community to review its master plan every five years to determine if it needs to be amended or if it is time to institute the process for a new master plan.

### The Five-Year Review

First, note that the Act requires this review every five years following adoption of the master plan. Although the five-year review may be considered perfunctory, a necessary “fill in the blank” action, communities should take advantage of this opportunity to thoroughly review their plan to make sure it is still relevant. Involving the legislative body in this review is also critical. At a minimum, the following questions should be considered:

- Have there been major changes in the community not anticipated in the current master plan? This could include events such as new utilities, major road improvements, or large development approvals among other things.
- Are there instances where the planning commission has departed from the master plan? Do the reasons for these departures demonstrate a need for an overall revision of the master plan?
- Are the goals and policies set out in the plan still relevant? An effective master plan will have a series of carefully crafted goals and policies describing the community’s vision for its future. Is the community still willing to take the actions necessary to implement them?

How does the future land use map and text compare with zoning actions taken since the plan was first adopted? Do the land use descriptions need to be revised to account for new development? This element contains the land use descriptions and map that depict specific land use arrangements.

There may be minor changes, e.g. changes in demographics or other statistical information, but if they do not appear to affect the overall intent of the plan, going through the entire amendment process may be delayed until more substantive changes are needed. If, after a careful review is conducted, it is determined that changes are necessary—the process outlined by the Michigan Planning Enabling Act must be carefully followed. Finally, while the Act requires this review every five years—communities should consider conducting this review annually, particularly in areas where development is active. As with the five-year review, this review should be documented to “refresh” the plan for the next five years.

\*An amendment to a master plan allows for a 42-day (not 63, as for a new plan) review by all outside entities/jurisdictions.





St. Joseph City Commission  
Commission Chambers  
700 Broad Street, St Joseph, MI 49085

**AGENDA**  
**July 12, 2021**  
**6:00 PM**

**Remote Viewing Instructions:** This is an in-person meeting in the City Commission Chambers, 700 Broad Street. Persons wishing to speak should be present at the meeting. The public can view and/or hear the meeting, without speaking, by going to Zoom.us on a computer or mobile device, or by calling 312.626.6799 (or 877.853.5247 toll free) and entering Meeting ID 985 8024 3222 and Password 4908549085. This is our first effort at streaming an in-person meeting and we appreciate your patience.

**Call to Order**

**Order of Business**

1. Pledge of Allegiance
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Public Comment
4. City Manager Comments
5. City Commission Comments

**Consent Agenda**

6. Regular Meeting Minutes of Monday, June 28, 2021
7. Invoice and Tax Disbursements
8. Update on City Operations
9. Board and Commission Appointment
10. Portable Radio Purchase
11. Public Safety Fire Pick-up Truck Purchase & Sale
12. Hybrid Public Safety Vehicle Purchase

**Old Business**

13. DDA Requests

**New Business**

14. Lakeshore Condominium Rubbish and Recycling
15. Zoning Ordinance Amendment - Article IX Special Districts - Section 9.5 MS-OD Main Street Corridor Overlay District - First Reading
16. Chapter 25 Sign Ordinance Amendment - Address Numbers, Allowed Projection and Minimum Clearance - First Reading of Adopting Ordinance
17. 2016 Master Plan 5-Year Review

**Reports**

- 18. August 3 Primary Election Reminder
- 19. Social Justice Committee Reports
- 20. Social District Update
- 21. Finance Director Hiring Process
- 22. Short-term Rental Bills
- 23. Upcoming City - Business Open House

**Adjournment**

Minutes of the St. Joseph City Commission Meeting held Commission Chambers, 700 Broad Street, St Joseph, MI 49085 on July 12, 2021.

**Remote Viewing Instructions: This is an in-person meeting in the City Commission Chambers, 700 Broad Street. Persons wishing to speak should be present at the meeting. The public can view and/or hear the meeting, without speaking, by going to Zoom.us on a computer or mobile device, or by calling 312.626.6799 (or 877.853.5247 toll free) and entering Meeting ID 985 8024 3222 and Password 4908549085. This is our first effort at streaming an in-person meeting and we appreciate your patience.**

### Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:02 PM by Mayor Michael Garey

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Michael Garey	Mayor	Present	
Jeffrey Richards	Commissioner	Present	
Laura Goos	Mayor Pro Tem	Present	
Lynn Todman	Commissioner	Present	
Michele Binkley	Commissioner	Present	
John Hodgson	City Manager	Present	
Laurie Schmidt	City Attorney	Present	
Denise Westfall	City Clerk	Present	

### Order of Business

1. Pledge of Allegiance
2. Approval of Agenda

Adopted.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Laura Goos, Mayor Pro Tem
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Lynn Todman, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Mayor Garey, Commissioner Richards, Mayor Pro Tem Goos, Commissioner Todman, Commissioner Binkley

3. Public Comment
- None.
4. City Manager Comments

City Manager John Hodgson stated that the item previously on the agenda listed as the PACE Program has been moved to the next meeting.

5. City Commission Comments

Commissioner Richards stated that it was nice to be back in person.

### Consent Agenda

Adopted.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Jeffrey Richards, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Lynn Todman, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Mayor Garey, Commissioner Richards, Mayor Pro Tem Goos, Commissioner Todman, Commissioner Binkley

6. Regular Meeting Minutes of Monday, June 28, 2021

Accepted.

7. Invoice and Tax Disbursements

maximum projection of 4" at heights below 6'8" and 1' at heights at or above 6'8", and minimum vertical clearance of 6'8" over public or private sidewalk, 15' over public right-of-way or drive aisles and no minimum vertical clearance for projections 4" or less.

Discussion followed about the recommended size limitation of an address sign.

Commissioner Goos stated restricting the height of an address number at 10" seemed too limiting and restrictive. She appreciated the changes made to follow the ADA requirements on projections.

Resident Mike Sarola questioned the reason behind the ordinance change and whether the DDA had any input. Business owner Deb Sailor Molitor and Sarola relayed that specific size limits were restrictive and do not allow for creativity or distinction, which is important to businesses and homeowners.

Gundersen explained that the Planning Commission worked on the draft sign ordinance over 2 years and was necessary to update the 1980 ordinance due to comply with changes in the law and to address technical changes in the sign industry. The draft ordinance was sent to the DDA and sign contractors before being adopted in January of 2020.

Commissioner Todman agreed that forcing small parameters seemed too restrictive.

Commissioner Binkley amended her motion to approve the first reading of the Sign Ordinance by removing the 10" restriction in Article I, Section 25-2 Definitions of "Signs" subsection (9).

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Michele Binkley, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Lynn Todman, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Mayor Garey, Commissioner Richards, Mayor Pro Tem Goos, Commissioner Todman, Commissioner Binkley

17. 2016 Master Plan 5-Year Review

**MOTION:** To accept the Planning Commission’s recommendation that no changes or amendments are made to the 2016 Master Plan at this time, and to bring it back for review in 5 years.

Community Development Director Kristen Gundersen stated a five-year review of the Master Plan is required by state law. The Planning Commission were asked to review the Master Plan, Downtown Vision Plan, and Parks Plan, and determine whether changes to the Master Plan were needed. City staff did not recommend an amendment to the Master Plan at this time, as the overall intent remains and is being followed.

Commissioners expressed agreement and noted how important it is to constantly review the Plans are to tie into the actions begin taken by the City. Commissioners suggested a public presentation in the future to relay all of the goals that have been accomplished.

**MOTION:** To accept the Planning Commission’s recommendation of the 5-year review of the 2016 Master Plan, that the Plan does not require changes or amendments at this time.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Jeffrey Richards, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Michele Binkley, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Mayor Garey, Commissioner Richards, Mayor Pro Tem Goos, Commissioner Todman, Commissioner Binkley

## Reports

### 18. August 3 Primary Election Reminder

City Clerk Denise Westfall reminded everyone of the upcoming August 3, 2021 Primary election. She said that there are currently 9 people running for the 3 open seats in November. After the August election the field will be narrowed down to the top 6, with the top 2 receiving a 4 year term and the 3rd highest will get a 2 year term.

Westfall stated that to date, the Clerk's office has issued 1042AV ballots and received 271.

### 19. Social Justice Committee Reports

Commissioner Goos reminded everyone that the Public Safety committee was on hiatus until Fall. Goos said that the Arts and Cultural committee was in full swing with fundraising for the four monuments through the Unified Monument Project.

Commissioner Todman reported for the History and Education committee, that in the Fall there will be a competition for high school students to view the Hidden History webinars and use different art forms to express what they have learned. Prizes will be awarded.

### 20. Social District Update

City Manager Hodgson said that there are currently five downtown establishments that have received MLCC approval and begun active participation in the social district. He understands it is going fine.

### 21. Finance Director Hiring Process

Commissioner Binkley reported that there were great candidates for the finance director position and the hiring committee has narrowed it down to two candidates for further interviews. The proposed special meeting to hold interviews would be at 6:00 p.m., Tuesday, July 20, 2021, in the City Commission Chambers.

### 22. Short-term Rental Bills

City Manager John Hodgson said that there has been no movement on the four bills on short term rentals. Residents who have feelings on this matter should consider contacting their elected representatives, and perhaps particularly to note that HB 4722 is in a position where it could be passed in the House, while SB 446 has not yet been considered on the floor of the Senate, and HB 4985 and SB 547 have not had committee hearings.

### 23. Upcoming City - Business Open House

Commissioner Goos reminded the public of the Open House from 5:30pm-7:00pm, on Wednesday, July 14, at the St. Joseph Today Welcome Center, 301 State Street, St. Joseph. The purpose of this meet & greet event is to create a connection to start an ongoing conversation

between the City and the business community. No business will be conducted.

The City will host three more meetings at City Hall to be held August 11, September 15, and October 13 at a time to be determined.

.

**Adjournment**

The meeting was closed at 7:48 PM

---

Presiding Officer

---

City Clerk/ Recording Secretary



St. Joseph Planning Commission  
 Commission Chambers  
 700 Broad Street, St Joseph, MI 49085

**AGENDA**  
**July 1, 2021**  
**4:30 PM**

**Call to Order**

**Approval of May 6, 2021 Meeting Minutes**

1. Regular Minutes of Thursday, May 06, 2021
2. May 6, 2021 Redline meeting minutes

**Approval of June 3, 2021 Meeting Minutes**

1. Regular Minutes of Thursday, June 03, 2021

**New Business**

1. Public Hearing - City of St. Joseph - Amendment to Article IX Special Districts - Creation of Main Street Overlay District - Residential on the Ground Floor

**Old Business**

2. Chapter 25 Sign Ordinance Amendment - Address Numbers and Allowed Projection with Clearance
3. Chapter 25 Sign Ordinance Amendment - Modification for Wall Signs
4. 5-year review of 2016 Master Plan
5. Organization Meeting - Receive Nominating Committee Report and Recommendation for Chair and Vice Chair for 2021-2022 Term

**Public Comments**

**Commissioner Comments**

**Adjournment**



# Agenda Item

**TO:** Planning Commission

**FROM:** Kristen Gundersen, Community Development Director

**RE:** 5-year review of 2016 Master Plan

**MEETING DATE:** July 1, 2021

In March and April of this year, staff forwarded information of adopted plans and a spreadsheet showing the progress on the Goals/Objectives and Tasks in the 2016 Master Plan for review. All members should have copies of the 2016 Master Plan, Downtown Vision Master Plan adopted in January 2020 and the Parks Plan 2021-2026 adopted in January 2021.

Typically, master plans are designed to look 20-years into the future to create a vision for the community. Changes are made to the document under several scenarios which can include a proposed project that does not comply with the future land use map or changes to existing conditions are taking place and make items within the adopted plan outdated or no longer necessary.

The Michigan Planning Enabling Act - Act 33 of 2008 requires that the Planning Commission shall review the master plan every five years to determine if the master plan needs to be amended or a new one adopted. The 2016 Master Plan was adopted in June 2016 and it is now time for the five year review. Attached is an informational handout prepared by the Michigan Municipal League (MML) providing information regarding the required Master Plan - Five Year Review.

Within the MML handout four questions are stated for consideration.

1. Have there been major changes in the community not anticipated in the current master plan? This could include events such as new utilities, major road improvements, or large development approvals among other things. *Looking back to the past five years, staff does not believe there have been any major changes in the community that were not anticipated in the master plan.*
2. Are there instances where the planning commission has departed from the master plan? Do the reasons for these departures demonstrate a need for an overall revision of the master plan? *Staff does not believe there have been any departures from the master plan. The few map amendments (rezonings) have taken place and have been in keeping with the master plan. Efforts have been made to make text amendments to the Zoning Ordinance as called out by the master plan and future ones are needed to address Redevelopment Ready Communities certification requirements.*
3. Are the goals and policies set out in the plan still relevant? An effective master plan will have a series of carefully crafted goals and policies describing the community's vision for its future. Is the community still willing to take the actions necessary to implement them? *Since the adoption of the 2016 Master Plan, the Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on the Downtown*



*Vision Master Plan which was adopted by the City Commission in January 2021. The City Commission also utilizes the 2016 Master Plan along with other adopted documents to help guide in decision making along with the adoption of the CIP.*

4. How does the future land use map and text compare with zoning actions taken since the plan was first adopted? Do the land use descriptions need to be revised to account for new development? This element contains the land use descriptions and map that depict specific land use arrangements. *The few map amendments (rezonings) that have taken place during the past five years have been in keeping with the adopted future land use map. Work continues on updating the Zoning Ordinance.*

City staff does not believe there are any conditions that would require an amendment to the 2016 Master Plan, as the overall intent of the plan remains and has been followed since adoption. After review and discussion if the Planning Commission concurs, a simple motion referencing review of the documents and the questions listed above were discussed and no additional changes are needed at this time.

The next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for August 5th.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- Michigan Municipal League - Fact Sheet - Master Plan 5 year review (PDF)



## Master Plan—Five-Year Review

### Introduction

The Michigan Legislature amended the Municipal Planning Act in 2002 to revise the legal processes necessary to adopt a new or amended master plan. Sometimes referred to as “The Coordinated Planning Act,” the amendment greatly expanded the notification process and the degree of involvement of the legislative body. In 2008, the Legislature combined the county, township, and city and village planning Acts into one Act: The Michigan Planning Enabling Act (MPEA). This Act retained the coordinated planning requirements of 2002. Municipalities wishing to begin work on a new master plan, or amend an existing plan, must follow this process. (See Fact Sheet entitled Updating the Master Plan—Mastering the Process). An additional provision of the MPEA (MCL 125.3845(2)) requires each community to review its master plan every five years to determine if it needs to be amended or if it is time to institute the process for a new master plan.

### The Five-Year Review

First, note that the Act requires this review every five years following adoption of the master plan. Although the five-year review may be considered perfunctory, a necessary “fill in the blank” action, communities should take advantage of this opportunity to thoroughly review their plan to make sure it is still relevant. Involving the legislative body in this review is also critical. At a minimum, the following questions should be considered:

- Have there been major changes in the community not anticipated in the current master plan? This could include events such as new utilities, major road improvements, or large development approvals among other things.
- Are there instances where the planning commission has departed from the master plan? Do the reasons for these departures demonstrate a need for an overall revision of the master plan?
- Are the goals and policies set out in the plan still relevant? An effective master plan will have a series of carefully crafted goals and policies describing the community’s vision for its future. Is the community still willing to take the actions necessary to implement them?

How does the future land use map and text compare with zoning actions taken since the plan was first adopted? Do the land use descriptions need to be revised to account for new development? This element contains the land use descriptions and map that depict specific land use arrangements.

There may be minor changes, e.g. changes in demographics or other statistical information, but if they do not appear to affect the overall intent of the plan, going through the entire amendment process may be delayed until more substantive changes are needed. If, after a careful review is conducted, it is determined that changes are necessary—the process outlined by the Michigan Planning Enabling Act must be carefully followed. Finally, while the Act requires this review every five years—communities should consider conducting this review annually, particularly in areas where development is active. As with the five-year review, this review should be documented to “refresh” the plan for the next five years.

\*An amendment to a master plan allows for a 42-day (not 63, as for a new plan) review by all outside entities/jurisdictions.