CALL TO ORDER
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
ROLL CALL
APPROVAL OF AGENDA
APPROVAL OF MINUTES -- Meeting of June 23, 2020
COMMUNICATIONS
CITIZEN COMMENTS
ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. **MASTER PLAN 2020**: Presentation by Carlisle Wortman Associates with discussion on Greenfield, Twelve Mile and Coolidge corridors and update on Master Plan community engagement activities.

2. **DISCUSSION**: Review and discussion for ordinance text amendments for modifying parking requirements during site plan review.

3. **DISCUSSION**: Review and discussion for ordinance text amendments for site plan projects and allowing extensions for site plan approvals.

LIAISON REPORTS
COMMISSIONER/STAFF COMMENTS
ADJOURN

Notice: Official Minutes of the City Planning Commission are stored and available for review at the office of the City Clerk.

If you would like to attend the electronic Planning Commission meeting, follow the below link or call the telephone number.
Join Zoom Meeting: https://berkleymich.zoom.us/j/93323204434

Dial by Phone: 1-312-626-6799

Meeting ID: 933 2320 4434
THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE BERKLEY CITY PLANNING COMMISSION WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 7:00 PM, JUNE 23, 2020 VIA ELECTRONIC MEETING BY CHAIR KRISTEN KAPELANSKI

The minutes from this meeting are in summary form capturing the actions taken on each agenda item. To view the meeting discussions in their entirety, this meeting is broadcasted on the city’s government access channel, WBRK, every day at 9AM and 9PM. The video can also be seen, on-demand, on the city’s YouTube channel: https://www.youtube.com/user/cityofberkley.

PRESENT:
Michele Buckler
Lisa Kempner
Martin Smith
Kristen Kapelanski
Tim Murad
Greg Patterson
Mark Richardson
Matt Trotto

ABSENT:
Jeff Campbell

ALSO PRESENT:
Erin Schlutow, Community Development Director
Torri Mathes, Community Engagement Officer
Dan Hill, Public Policy Assistant
Stan Lisica, Innovation Officer

* * * * * * * *

APPROVAL OF AGENDA
It was moved by Commissioner Murad to approve the Agenda supported by Commissioner Buckler.

AYES: Kempner, Murad, Patterson, Richardson, Smith, Trotto, Buckler, Kapelanski
NAYS: None
ABSENT: Campbell

* * * * * * * *

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
It was moved by Commissioner Trotto to approve the minutes from May 26, 2020 and supported by Commissioner Kempner.

AYES: Murad, Patterson, Richardson, Smith, Trotto, Buckler, Kempner, Kapelanski
NAYS: None
ABSENT: Campbell

* * * * * * * *

COMMUNICATIONS
None.

* * * * * * * *

CITIZEN COMMENTS
Chair Kapelanski read instructions for public to submit comments during the virtual meeting.

None.

* * * * * * * *
1. **PUBLIC HEARING**: Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment Section 138-298 to remove references to BOCA.

   Community Development Director Schlutow provided a summary of the April 18, 2020 memo related to the reason for the removal of BOCA from the Zoning Ordinance and replacement with the Michigan Residential Code.

   Chair Kapelanski opened the public hearing at 7:06pm.

   No public comment.

   Chair Kapelanski closed the public hearing at 7:06pm.

   Commissioner Smith motioned to recommend approval of the removal of references to BOCA in Section 138-298 to City Council. Supported by Commissioner Murad.

   AYES: Patterson, Richardson, Smith, Trotto, Buckler, Kempner, Murad, Kapelanski
   NAYS: None
   ABSENT: Campbell

2. **PUBLIC HEARING**: Local Business District (LB) site regulations in the Schedule of Regulations, Section 138-526.

   Community Development Director Schlutow summarized the staff report detailing the proposed ordinance text amendment to add site development standards related to height, setbacks, lot coverage, etc. to Section 138-526, *Schedule of Regulations* in the Berkley Zoning Ordinance.

   Chair Kapelanski opened the public hearing at 7:09pm.

   No public comment.

   Chair Kapelanski closed the public hearing at 7:09pm.

   Commissioner Patterson motioned to recommend approval of the ordinance amendment to include site regulations for the Local Business District in Section 138-526, *Schedule of Regulations*, in the Berkley Zoning Ordinance to City Council. Supported by Commissioner Buckler.

   AYES: Richardson, Smith, Trotto, Buckler, Kempner, Murad, Patterson, Kapelanski
   NAYS: None
   ABSENT: Campbell

3. **DISCUSSION**: Review and discussion for ordinance text amendments for modifying parking requirements during site plan review.

   Director Schlutow provided a summary of the discussion item and proposed ordinance amendment. It had been previously discussed at the February 2020 Planning Commission meeting. Draft Ordinance language was provided to the Commissioners to discuss.

   Commissioners discussed possibilities related to land banking for future needs and the need to carefully review each request as it is presented and not give approvals for every request.

   Director Schlutow will put together additional information for the Commissioners to review at the next
meeting.

4. **MASTER PLAN 2020**: Update on progress of Master Plan community engagement activities and discussion for structure of Master Plan document.

   Director Schlutow provided an update on the number of responses to the community survey, the online webinar series hosted by Carlisle Wortman, and focus group discussions. It was requested for the PC to discuss how they would like the Master Plan document to be organized.

   Commissioners discussed a thematic design for the MP document and possible themes including, sustainability, housing, community aesthetic, strong downtowns, urban recreation, strong downtown.

   * * * * * * * * * *

**LIAISON REPORTS**

Commissioner Richardson provided an update on the Environmental Committee, and were able to meet for the first time since February. Commissioner Richardson was re-elected as Chair. He reported that the Stormwater Detention Project is continuing and possible recommendations will be forthcoming. Also discussing possibility of a community garden.

Commissioner Trotto was unable to attend the June DDA meeting.

Commissioner Murad attended the Chamber meeting. He reported that most summer events have been cancelled and there are ongoing discussions related to assisting businesses with outdoor dining, sales opportunities.

Commissioner Patterson attended the Parks & Recreation Board meeting. He reported on the status of the P&R Master Plan and development of Oxford Merchants Park splash pad.

* * * * * * * * * *

**STAFF/COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

None.

Commissioner Murad motioned to adjourn. Motion supported by Commissioner Trotto

   AYES: Smith, Trotto, Buckler, Kempner, Murad, Patterson, Richardson, Kapelanski
   NAYS: None
   ABSENT: Campbell

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:17pm.
TO: Berkley Planning Commission

FROM: Ben Carlisle, AICP  
Megan Masson-Minock, AICP

DATE: July 23, 2020

RE: Update on Master Plan Activity

We hope this memo finds you and your families healthy, happy, and safe! Thanks to all of you who helped promote or participated in the survey, focus groups and video presentations. Utilizing the input gathered, we are starting to draft the Master Plan.

**Action to Date**

During June and July, we wrapped up our on-line community engagement for this phase of the process, including completion of the final report on the survey, the conclusion of the video presentations and focus groups.

**Survey**

The survey was available throughout the month of May, with 1,317 responses. Due to the size of the response and similarities between demographics of Berkley and city residents who took the survey, we feel confident that the survey represents the breadth of the community and can be one of many factors in the decision making process. See the attached report for more information.

**Video Presentations**

We completed the eight video presentations. Between YouTube viewers and webinar participants, we routinely had around 20 live viewers. The videos have been posted to YouTube and have view numbers ranging from 14 (Housing) to 33 (What is a Master Plan?). The Steering Committee felt these videos are good education pieces. **We would appreciate your advice on how to find a wider audience for the video presentations**, which can be viewed at https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLCNezdUz1g2WS1_XIJmLaV5mEstDT9lkq.

**Zoom Focus Groups**

Eight focus groups with business owners, developers and realtors, seniors, religious leaders, boards members and commissioners, and residents and young families have been completed. A report is attached.
Drafting the Master Plan

We are starting to produce content to share with the community:

Vision, Mission, and Values

A draft version of a vision, mission and values were reviewed and vetted with the Steering Committee and then shared with public at the video presentation on June 30th (see attached).

*We would appreciate your input on the draft vision, mission, and values* before a draft returns to the Steering Committee and the broader public in the fall.

Focus Items:

We have identified a number of key items we think are opportunities for the Master Plan to focus on. These items were either identified in consultation with the Steering Committee, Planning Commission, and City Council; other community engagement activities (survey, focus groups), or identified based on our professional recommendations and best practices. Over the next two months, we will be sharing these items with the Steering Committee and the Planning Commission for your input on which questions to ask the community and how to do so.

At our recent meeting with the Steering Committee, we discussed focus items on Greenfield, 12 Mile and Coolidge. Based on input from the Steering Committee, we would like to move forward with the following approaches to those areas. *Your input on whether these approaches and how to discuss it with the community would be appreciated.*

Greenfield

At one point, the City planned and zoned Greenfield for uses other than single family zoning. However, due to a myriad of reasons, particularly limited lot depth and lot width, uses other than single-family have not developed. The Steering Committee noted that Greenfield provides one of the few places that housing diversity could be achieved. Diversity of housing may include low-density multiple family, townhomes, or attached products. However, due to existing physical conditions of the corridor, without expanding the depth of the Greenfield Zoning District to 2-3 parcels deep from Greenfield, we predict that the land use mix will remain mostly single-family, due to the difficulties of lot consolidation and depth.

The Steering Committee recommended the Greenfield Zoning be planned to go at least two parcels deep, with design requirements for the front door of any multiple-family building to be on Ellwood Avenue with height (no more than 2-3 stories) and architectural and bulk requirements for new buildings to blend with the existing neighborhoods.
We would appreciate input from you on the following:

- Should the front door of new developments on back to back lots face Ellwood?
- What design regulations, if any, are needed?
- Why are there differing depths of the Greenfield Zoning District? 1 lot deep Webster to Edwards, Beverly to Wiltshire and Catalpa to Cambridge; 2 lots deep at the intersection with Oxford and Cambridge to the alley behind 11 Mile; 3 lots deep from Edwards to Beverly.
- How should this conversation be held with the public, especially after the controversy over the form-based code proposal?

12 Mile and Coolidge

The survey results indicate a strong desire for the creation of mixed-use, pedestrian and bike-friendly corridors. We discussed with the Steering Committee traffic calming measures on 12 Mile that would make it a “people” street with the mix of uses and gathering spaces that were seen as desired by survey respondents (see attached memo to the Steering Committee).

The Steering Committee felt proposals like these were well documented and received in the Downtown Plan and could be included in the Master Plan without additional community conversation. However, they were concerned about parking along these corridors and asked for options to be further explored to right-size parking and, in some places, remove parking requirements where adequate public parking could be in place. The replacement of the bicycle lane on Coolidge with on-street parking, bump outs and/or wider sidewalks was discussed. We also discussed planning for the depth of parcels along 12 Mile and Coolidge to go deeper to facilitate redevelopment of these corridors. The Steering Committee felt it was a worthwhile discussion to have with the community, with education as to why additional depth was needed.

Input from you on the following would be helpful:

- What do you see as the future for the road diet on Coolidge?
- From the placement of the Parking Zoning District, it seems like expanding the depth of lots along 12 Mile and Coolidge was done previously. What was the history? When and why was the effort scaled back or ended?
- How should we approach conversations regarding the potential the changes to the street itself and to the depth of parcels to facilitate more businesses and uses on 12 Mile and Coolidge?
Megan will attend your upcoming meeting and happy to discuss the issues above. Thank you again for the opportunity to assist with your Master Plan!

Yours Truly,

Benjamin R. Carlisle
CARLISLE/WORTMAN ASSOC., INC.
Benjamin R. Carlisle, AICP, LEED AP
Principal

Megan Masson-Minock, AICP
Planner
**VISION**

What the City of Berkley aspires to be...

*Berkley will be a thriving 21st century municipality, rooted in strong neighborhoods and a walkable design, supported by a caring community that helps every resident, business, and visitor to flourish.*
MISSION

Berkley will strive to enhance economic vitality, preserve neighborhoods, and foster progress to implement the City's vision and values.

What City officials and staff do daily to achieve the vision...
VALUES Principles to guide decisions to stay on mission and achieve the vision...

Berkley is active (dynamic)
Berkley will make decisions to keep the City active, such as maintaining its walkable design, honoring the needs of pedestrians and cyclists as well as drivers, and creating and maintaining places where people of all ages can be active.

Berkley is responsible (caring)
Berkley will make responsible decisions, such as providing excellent services, offering programs for young and old and helping those in need. In each decision, the City should inquire and consider how those impacted will be affected.

Berkley is innovative (progressive)
Berkley will make decisions that foster and welcome progress in terms of technology, sustainability, and policy, such as energy-efficient lighting, green infrastructure, and updated zoning.

Berkley is welcoming (inclusive)
Berkley will make decisions that welcome new residents, businesses, and visitors, such as maintaining a business-friendly atmosphere and hosting events that draw visitors from around the region.
In this ever changing times, we hope this memo finds you and your family healthy, happy, and safe! Since we last meet in June, we’ve finalized our online engagement and focus groups, and have identified keys issues for Master Plan discussion. If you haven’t already, we strongly encourage each member of the Steering Committee to review the eight (8) webinars that each focused on an individual aspect of the Master Plan. The background to much of what we want to discuss at the July Steering Committee can be found in the webinars. The webinars can be found here: https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC3d4Vf-HU0W_MRnp6GoKv9g

We are excitedly moving into the plan drafting stage of the process. We want to spend our valuable time together to discuss two key items:

1. Summary of survey results and focus group engagement.
2. Identification of major master plan focus items

**Summary of Survey Results and Focus Group Engagement**

As attachments to this memo, you will find summary reports of the almost 1,400 survey responses and eight (8) focus groups and interviews. We would like to release these to the Planning Commission and the public. Please let us know if you have any concerns, edits or suggestions.

**Focus Items:**

We have identified a number of focus discussion items, organized by with the themes of corridors, neighborhoods, and systems. Each of these key focus items will need to be shared, discussed and decided upon during 2020 as part of the Master Plan process. These items were either identified in consultation with the Steering Committee, Planning Commission, and City Council; other community engagement activities (survey, focus groups), or identified based on our professional recommendations and best practices.

We will be bringing these focus discussion items to the Steering Committee in upcoming meetings. We expect these focus discussion items to evolve as plan drafting and ongoing
community engagement continues, but we’d like to obtain some input at this stage in the plan drafting process.

During your upcoming meeting, we would like to start the initial discussion on Corridors, focusing on 12-Mile, Coolidge, and Greenfield. We will discuss Woodward and 11-Mile at the next meeting. The survey results indicate a powerful desire for commercial, entertainment, and mixed use, walkability/bikeability, and placemaking on the corridors. As noted during the corridor webinar, without considering alternative zoning and planning concepts, changes in uses along the corridors, pedestrian and non-motorized transportation improvements, and to development/redevelopment opportunities are limited.

We would appreciate your feedback on the following focus items:

**12-Mile and Coolidge**

**Roadway Configuration and Traffic Calming**

We spoke at length about “people” streets vs. “automobile” streets during the corridor webinar (see graphic below). High traffic speeds and volume to not create or allow for shopping, mixed use and walkable environments. It may be difficult to achieve the desired uses identified in the survey without rethinking corridors.

**People Streets:**
- Streets are fairly narrow with no more than two lanes of traffic and parking on either side — all of which means cars must drive slowly.
- Sidewalks and bump-outs, crosswalks and signals make it easy for people to cross the street.
- Trees offer shade to people walking.
- Businesses open right onto the sidewalk, easily accessible to passersby on foot and attracting the attention of people driving slowly as well.
- Mix of uses: Residences and offices occupy the second (and in some cases, third, fourth and fifth) floors of these buildings providing additional tax revenue and putting more people within walking distance of the local businesses below.

**Automobile Streets:**
- Wide roads with multiples lanes of traffic and no on-street parking — all of which encourages fast driving.
- Sidewalks are uninviting.
- Crosswalks are spaced far apart, if there are any at all.
- Limited landscaping. No trees shade the sidewalk.
- Primary objective is to move traffic.
We would appreciate your input on whether we should ask and if so, how, the following questions:

1. Should additional traffic calming measures be considered on 12 Mile? Options could include a road diet, lowering of speeds, areas of increased on street parking, and bumpouts.

2. Should the Master Plan call for a permanent road diet on Coolidge? The replacement of the bicycle lane with on-street parking could be an option.

**12-Mile and Coolidge: Parcel Redevelopment**

The survey results indicated a strong desire for commercial, entertainment, and mixed uses on the corridors. As noted during the corridor webinar, there are some natural limitations to development/redevelopment. One of the most significant limitations is parcel size/depth coupled with need to provide onsite parking. Simply put, many of the parcels are too small to do significant redevelopment. In addition, requiring off-street parking on sites reduces already limited potential buildable area.

The development limitation example on the following page illustrates the difference between the two options described here:

Again, we would appreciate you insight as to whether we should ask these questions and if yes, how should they be asked:

1. Should we plan for the corridor land uses to go “deeper”? Planning to go “deeper” would provide for lot consolidation, which creates larger lots that are easier and more economically feasible to redevelop. However, there are significant considerations to allowing corridors to go deeper.

2. Should requirements for onsite parking be reduced or eliminated for redevelopments of lots along certain corridors? Eliminating onsite parking requirements will reduce a redevelopment barrier on these smaller lots. Eliminating onsite parking can’t be done in isolation as additional parking must be considered. If requiring onsite parking is eliminated, parking alternatives may include:

   a. City rents private lots for public use;
   b. City creates more public lots (surface lots or parking decks);
   c. City assigns short-term parking along corridors;
   d. Payment in lieu to fund additional public parking; or
   e. City creates more on-street parking

3. What other strategies should be encouraged to provide for commercial, entertainment and mixed-use on corridors?
On a standard 4,000 sq.ft lot, a 2,200 sq.ft one-story retail building requires 7 parking spaces. However, only 4 spaces fit on site.

45% of the lot is taken up with parking and required drive-aisle width. However, the four spaces only account for ½ of the required parking.

Essentially, you cannot build a one-story 2,200 sq.ft building or a multiple story building on a standard lot.

On the same standard 4,000 sq.ft lot, not requiring onsite parking allows for a building that could be 7,200 sq.ft and two stories. The second story could be office or residential, creating a true mixed-use building.

The ability to develop a 7,200 sq/ft building is more economically feasible.
4. How should the City plan for Multiple Family Residential along corridors? Options include mixed use buildings, designation of multiple-family areas along corridors, and allowances for residential areas on corridors with a mix of residential uses.

**No Alternative Concepts**

If the city does not want to make changes to roadway configuration, parking requirements, or parcel depth, then significant land use, non-motorized improvements, or redevelopment changes will likely not occur. That being the case, if the city does not wish to pursue these noted alternative concepts, should the city consider:

1. Streetscape improvements along 12-mile (lighting, landscaping, street furniture); and/or
2. Façade improvement/ rebate program.

**Greenfield:**

The land use pattern of single-family is well established. The Greenfield Zoning district does permit a number of other uses including offices, places of worship, and senior housing facilities; however as you can see on zoning map on right, most of the corridor only has those lots that front on Greenfield zoned the Greenfield Zoning District. There are some sections that are “two parcels deep” with Greenfield Zoning.

Similar to issues as discussed on 12-mile and Coolidge, limited lot size coupled with zoning restrictions makes any use other than single-family difficult. In order to address these issues, we would appreciate your input on whether we should ask and if so, how, the following questions:
a. If to fully implement the Greenfield District zoning, should the City consider rezoning at the entire corridor at least “two parcels deep” with Greenfield Zoning.

b. If all of the Greenfield corridor is rezoned to ensure that Greenfield Zoning District is at least “two parcels deep”, the Greenfield Zoning District could:
   i. Either continue to allow for the current mix of other uses including offices, places of worship, and senior housing facilities; or
   ii. Amend zoning regulations to focus on single-family, two-family attached, and/or townhome style development along Greenfield.

c. Conversely, due to the issues of an established single-family land use pattern and potential compatibility issues, the City may consider not make any significant land use changes and consider eliminating Greenfield Zoning District.

Thank you for serving on the Berkley Master Plan Steering Committee! We look forward to meeting with you next Tuesday evening!

Yours Truly,

[Signatures]

Benjamin R. Carlisle
CARLISLE/WORTMAN ASSOC., INC.
Benjamin R. Carlisle, AICP, LEED AP
Principal

Megan Masson-Minock, AICP
Planner
As part of the Berkley Master Plan update, an electronic survey was made available throughout May 2020. Paper survey were mailed or delivered to City residents upon request. The survey was developed by City staff and Carlisle Wortman Associates, the planning consultant engaged to assist in the Master Plan update, with guidance from the Master Plan Steering Committee and the Planning Commission.

Statistics on the survey are:

- 1,317 survey respondents.
- 1,280 of the respondents, just over 97%, were City residents. One quarter of those respondents had lived in the City for over 30 years, 36% between 11 and 30 years and just under 40% had lived in Berkley for 10 years or less.
- A ballot box stuffing report showed that, excluding the IP address from which the paper survey responses were logged, eight surveys came from the same IP address. The open answer responses were reviewed and were dissimilar enough to conclude that the surveys came from unique individuals. Those surveys were included in the analysis in this report.

The report includes a written analysis for each section of the survey with statistics from the multiple-choice questions and highlights from the open-ended questions. A verbatim report of the open-ended responses has been provided to City staff and is available upon request. Each section includes charts or tables with data from the multiple-choice questions and word clouds from open-ended questions.

**Likes Analysis**

The top “likes” from the respondents were (over 50%):

- Location in the region
- Small town feel
- Everything I need is nearby
- Quality of schools
- Quality of City Services

In the open ended responses, the items listed above were listed, often with some explanation. However, the following phrases or items were mentioned by multiple respondents:

- Friendly neighbor and neighborhoods
- Safety and the quality of the police
- Free parking in the downtown and other corridors
- Restrictions on overnight parking
Final Report: City of Berkley Master Plan Survey

- Trees
- Parks
- Local businesses and restaurants
- Low or affordable taxes

Several respondents commented on items they missed, such as the Ice Arena and the Hiller’s Grocery Store.

3. What do you like best about Berkley? (check at most 5 responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location in the region</td>
<td>74.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small town feel</td>
<td>71.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everything I need is nearby</td>
<td>55.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational opportunities</td>
<td>7.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of housing</td>
<td>27.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of schools</td>
<td>62.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of city services</td>
<td>54.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special and community events</td>
<td>22.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>8.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants/dining options</td>
<td>28.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td>4.43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 1,310)

Note: Multiple answers per participant possible. Percentages added may exceed 100 since a participant may select more than one answer for this question.

Changes Analysis

The top “changes” from the respondents were (over 40%):

- More shopping options
- More recreational opportunities
In the open ended responses, the following phrases or items were mentioned by multiple respondents:

- Elimination of the road diet and/or bicycle lane on Coolidge.
- More types of restaurants, particularly those that are family friendly, i.e. not bars.
- Less hair salons
- Need and/or desire for a grocery store in the City limits
- An improved community center
- More parks and green space, including a dog park
- Better roads, sidewalks, and infrastructure
- Less new housing builds that are larger than the existing houses in the neighborhood
- Prohibition of marijuana businesses

Several respondents commented that they did not see the need for change and like things in Berkley as the presently are. Also, some respondents wanted modifications to or the removal of the prohibition on overnight parking on residential streets. However, under “Likes”, far more respondents cited the overnight parking prohibition as something they liked about Berkley.

4. What changes would you like to see in Berkley? (check at most 5 responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More types of housing</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased safety for pedestrians</td>
<td>26.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More jobs</td>
<td>12.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased housing affordability</td>
<td>17.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More shopping options</td>
<td>30.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better public transportation</td>
<td>14.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better city services</td>
<td>17.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More recreational opportunities</td>
<td>48.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased parking</td>
<td>18.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less parking</td>
<td>2.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better access to bus systems</td>
<td>8.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More bicycle paths or bicycle lanes</td>
<td>22.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less bicycle paths or bicycle lanes</td>
<td>24.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased safety for bicyclists</td>
<td>17.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td>21.95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Multiple answers per participant possible. Percentages added may exceed 100 since a participant may select more than one answer for this question.
Housing Analysis

The answers to the two multiple-choice questions on housing – “How important is it for the City of Berkley to plan for housing for the following groups?” and “How important is it for the City of Berkley to plan for the following types of new housing?” – showed conflicting priorities amongst the respondents. For housing for certain groups, planning for housing for households with children (75.63%) was seen as very important or important as well as for seniors (61.25%) and the disabled (61.96%). However, the only type of housing that most respondents supported planning for was single-family housing (82.99%). Seniors and the disabled often need in-home care, experience mobility issues which can be challenging in a single-family home. Other types of housing are often more attractive for these groups, such as apartments or attached single-family units.

In the open ended responses, the following ideas and themes were expressed:

- Berkley is a primarily single-family community and should remain so.
- Respondents expressed concerns about “big-foot” houses with suggestions and requests to regulate or build the size of the newly constructed single-family houses. Many respondents felt the cookie cutter nature of new builds detracted from the character of the neighborhoods. Others suggested there was a market for ranch or rambler single-story houses.
- Many were adamantly against housing for low-income households while others expressed a need for affordability and diversity in Berkley’s housing.
- The need for senior housing was expressed.
- Many respondents asked that Berkley not be turned into Royal Oak with tall, residential buildings overwhelming the downtown and corridors.
- Some respondents suggested mixed use and multiple-family on the corridors and the edges of the City would be appropriate.
Parking and Transportation Analysis

The multiple choice question on parking showed differing priorities amongst the respondents. Almost 40% felt that there was not a parking problem, while slightly more than 28% felt there was not enough parking. Just over 22% felt that commercial or school parking on residential streets was a challenge and almost 22% felt that more municipal parking was need. Less than 3% felt there was too much parking. In the open-ended responses on parking, the following ideas or sentiments were shared:

- Parking should be handled on a case by case basis
- If additional stores, restaurants, or multiple-family housing were to be allowed, the location and volume of parking resulting needs to be part of the equation.
- Lack of parking for businesses
- Need for more parking for the schools, including the High School
- Requests for overnight parking to be allowed, with the suggestion of parking permits. However, multiple respondents expressed their support for continuing the overnight parking restriction.
- Some respondents said there was not enough parking along Woodward and others experienced a lack of parking on 12 Mile.
- Support for free parking in Berkley.
- Requests for bicycle parking.
• Suggestions for a parking deck or structure.
• Many respondents expressed that they had never experienced a parking problem in Berkley.
• High volume at popular restaurants results in parking on nearby residential streets.

In terms of transportation, the multiple-choice questions on the importance of different transportation issues showed the following as very important or important to the respondents: manageable traffic volumes (76.29%), conditions of the roads (96.36%) and the conditions of sidewalks (94.26%). Other types of transportation had less support: access to bicycle lanes or paths for recreation (45.74%), access to bicycle lanes or paths for commuting or daily travel (32.55%), and access to bus service (38.31%).

The following ideas were shared in the open-ended questions on transportation:

• Restoration of Coolidge to four-lanes and removal of the bicycle lanes. A few of the respondents did express support for the road diet.
• Requests for better public transit options, from buses to trains. Many respondents felt increased public transit should be part of a County or regional effort.
• Conditions of sidewalks needed to be improved.
• Need for resurfacing or repairs to Wiltshire.

8. Parking has been identified as a concern in Berkley. Please check the parking challenges you see in Berkley (select all you feel are relevant):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too much parking</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough parking overall</td>
<td>28.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not a parking problem</td>
<td>38.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking requirements are too restrictive</td>
<td>19.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking requirements are not restrictive enough</td>
<td>4.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial or school parking on residential streets</td>
<td>22.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking on corridors (Coolidge, 11 Mile, 12 Mile)</td>
<td>14.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More municipal parking needed</td>
<td>21.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More on-street parking needed</td>
<td>13.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td>7.21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Multiple answers per participant possible. Percentages added may exceed 100 since a participant may select more than one answer for this question.
Gathering Places Analysis

The multiple choice question on types of gathering spaces showed new construction or projects, aside from maybe an outdoor plaza downtown would be controversial. The respondents were divided on the renovation of the community center versus construction of a new community center. The survey points to the need for more community conversations around that topic.

The multiple choice question on the types of recreational programming showed a preference amongst the respondents for festivals (24.42% in the highest rating) and programming for children (29.01% with the highest rating). The responses on other programming for seniors and adults were not highly wanted or opposed. Rentals for private events had the highest opposition (18.52% with the lowest ranking).

The following ideas were shared in the open-ended questions on gathering spaces:

- Many respondents expressed support for a new Community Center and suggested ideas for that facility, such as an indoor track and a pool. However, others expressed support for a renovation.
- Several respondents shared that a dog park was needed.
- Many supported the creation of more gathering spaces but expressed concerns also about road closures and impact on businesses and neighborhood.
- Many mentioned the closure of Robina and the pilot pocket park as a good experiment but many also shared implementation flaws with pilot: impacts on businesses, lack of maintenance, etc.

### 12. Gathering spaces have been identified as a want or need by some in the community. Rate what type of gathering spaces you want to see in Berkley on a 1-10 scale with 10 being the most desired and 1 being the least.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outdoor plaza downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.38%</td>
<td>3.27%</td>
<td>4.63%</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>14.92%</td>
<td>7.90%</td>
<td>11.41%</td>
<td>16.52%</td>
<td>7.26%</td>
<td>19.95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seating areas along major streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>203</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.49%</td>
<td>8.69%</td>
<td>9.91%</td>
<td>7.55%</td>
<td>17.63%</td>
<td>8.53%</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
<td>9.34%</td>
<td>3.82%</td>
<td>7.64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small pocket parks along major streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.74%</td>
<td>5.81%</td>
<td>6.61%</td>
<td>6.21%</td>
<td>17.90%</td>
<td>10.81%</td>
<td>10.89%</td>
<td>12.82%</td>
<td>5.89%</td>
<td>10.32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Renovate community center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>246</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.97%</td>
<td>5.84%</td>
<td>5.44%</td>
<td>5.11%</td>
<td>13.80%</td>
<td>5.44%</td>
<td>8.77%</td>
<td>11.77%</td>
<td>7.55%</td>
<td>16.31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Build new community center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>242</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.45%</td>
<td>5.06%</td>
<td>4.74%</td>
<td>2.89%</td>
<td>8.68%</td>
<td>4.66%</td>
<td>5.95%</td>
<td>8.12%</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
<td>33.04%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Music pavilion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>210</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.95%</td>
<td>6.05%</td>
<td>7.83%</td>
<td>7.59%</td>
<td>16.87%</td>
<td>8.39%</td>
<td>10.33%</td>
<td>9.93%</td>
<td>5.97%</td>
<td>10.09%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12a. Rate what type programming in gathering spaces you want to see in Berkley on a 1-10 scale with 10 being the most desired and 1 being the least.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Festivals</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>1,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.93%</td>
<td>2.42%</td>
<td>4.59%</td>
<td>3.38%</td>
<td>11.12%</td>
<td>8.14%</td>
<td>12.49%</td>
<td>17.41%</td>
<td>9.11%</td>
<td>24.42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Concerts</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.31%</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>5.70%</td>
<td>5.38%</td>
<td>14.51%</td>
<td>9.29%</td>
<td>12.55%</td>
<td>16.30%</td>
<td>7.91%</td>
<td>16.30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Rentals for private events</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.52%</td>
<td>6.89%</td>
<td>9.63%</td>
<td>8.06%</td>
<td>19.93%</td>
<td>9.88%</td>
<td>9.05%</td>
<td>8.80%</td>
<td>2.99%</td>
<td>6.23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Programs for adults</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.46%</td>
<td>2.24%</td>
<td>6.13%</td>
<td>6.13%</td>
<td>19.04%</td>
<td>10.18%</td>
<td>16.56%</td>
<td>16.39%</td>
<td>6.04%</td>
<td>10.84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Programs for seniors</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>1,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.93%</td>
<td>3.61%</td>
<td>5.90%</td>
<td>4.02%</td>
<td>17.62%</td>
<td>8.44%</td>
<td>13.20%</td>
<td>15.98%</td>
<td>7.95%</td>
<td>14.34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Programs for children</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>1,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.62%</td>
<td>2.07%</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
<td>2.31%</td>
<td>11.74%</td>
<td>6.03%</td>
<td>9.92%</td>
<td>18.93%</td>
<td>10.99%</td>
<td>29.01%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Corridor Analysis

The responses to multiple choice questions on corridors, except for Greenfield, indicate a powerful desire for commercial, entertainment, and mixed use, walkability/bikeability, and placemaking on the corridors. Below are key data points from the questions on each corridor:

- **Greenfield**: 40.85% felt the regulations for Greenfield should remain as is with the intent to make it a mixed use area.

- **Coolidge**: Restaurants (64.67%) and entertainment venues (49.96%) were land uses identified as needed on the corridor. No land use was seen as too much by more than 16% of the respondents.

- **Woodward**: No land use was too much by more than 10% of the respondents. Many respondents were neutral on the amount of land uses (45% for research/industrial to 10% for restaurants). Office (59.3%) and institutional (50.12%) was seen as the right amount with a need for more entertainment venues (44.89%).

- **11 Mile**: More retail (59.21%) and restaurants (69.24%) was seen as needed. Research/industrial was seen as too much by 22.52 of respondents to that question.

- **12 Mile**: Restaurants (55.35%) and entertainment venues (55.32%) were land uses identified as needed on 12 Mile with the amount of institutional uses was seen a just right by 59.97% of respondents to the question.
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The following ideas were shared in the open-ended questions on corridors:

Greenfield
- Respondents swung between keeping it single-family residential, adding duplexes and multiple-family to the mix to getting rid of the single-family uses for an office, multiple-family or mixed use area.
- Many respondent mentioned how Greenfield was different from the rest of the City in terms of character and maintenance.
- Unique land use suggestions included green space, entities to support Beaumont, senior housing, and a long term hospice medical care facility

Coolidge
- Many respondents asked for the road diet to be eliminated and the road returned to four lanes. A few respondents liked the road diet.
- Many of the comments talked about the character of the corridor – it needs a more downtown feel, it did not feel cohesive, a more diverse mix of businesses, etc. Some like the variety in facades.
- La Sallette was mentioned several times, particularly a desire to have the building used and not sit vacant.
- Parking was cited as an issue.
- A handful of respondents mentioned the influence of the High School as well their negative perception of the school district buying additional property along Coolidge.
- Unique suggestions included a full streetscape renovation and a pop-up store.

Woodward
- Many respondents mentioned the lack of parking. Some cited it as a reason that business do not grow or leave Woodward. Others voiced resentment of the encroachment of parking onto residential streets, particularly from employees of Woodward businesses. Some asked that parking areas do not encroach into adjacent neighborhoods.
- Many felt that it was a good area for mixed use including offices, research, restaurants, and retail. A few stated that they felt multiple-family would be a poor choice for Woodward.
- Many respondents were concerned about the vacancies along Woodward. Also, many felt the area needed some beautification efforts as an entrance to Berkley.
- Unique suggestions included a pedestrian bridge or tunnel to cross Woodward, a parking structure and using the berm space next to cemetery for walking/bike path.

11 Mile
- Many respondents mentioned the need for facelift or beautification efforts along 11 Mile.
- Opinions on land use were mixed. Some felt the current land uses, especially the industrial, was fine while others felt that more uses, such as stores or restaurants were needed. Many of the respondents mentioned how 11 Mile has mostly industrial uses at the western end of the corridor and more residential at the eastern end. One respondent suggested that an anchor was needed for the corridor. If multiple-family housing was mentioned, it was generally seen as an inappropriate use for 11 Mile.
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- Unique suggestions included increasing the speed limit to 35 miles per hour, lofts in former industrial buildings, and an indoor playscape for kids.

12 Mile
- Many felt that 12 Mile needed to be made a destination rather than a place to drive through. Improvements in walkability were suggested.
- Multiple respondents were concerned about the business mix on 12 Mile. Some cited the amount of hair salons or dental offices as a problem. Others mentioned that they could not find their daily needs on 12 Mile and missed some of the stores that used to be there. Others asked for more entertainment options.
- Many respondents were concerned about the number of vacancies and the appearance of the corridor overall, with suggestions for improving facades. Several respondents felt that the western end of 12 Mile needed more attention in terms of appearance and amount of vacancies.
- Many respondents felt the Berkley Theater should be reopened as a theater.
- Unique suggestions included pocket park spaces, a grocery store, bakery, and butcher shop

Corridors overall
- Many wanted protection of neighborhoods to be factored into any decision on corridors.
- Multiple respondents did not want uses that they felt threatened the family-friendly atmosphere of Berkley, such as cannabis businesses, bars, tattoo parlors, etc. Some felt that multiple-family housing was inappropriate as well.
- Respondents, although often supportive of new development on corridors, urged respect for the context of Berkley, frequently requesting building height restrictions (no more that 2-4 stories).

14. Greenfield: The current regulations allow single-family, multiple family and office. However, most of the properties are single-family homes. Which option for the future do you most agree with? (Select one option)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The regulations for Greenfield should change to maintain current conditions (primarily single-family)</td>
<td>20.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The regulations for Greenfield should remain as is, with the intent for Greenfield to become a mixed-use area</td>
<td>40.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need more information</td>
<td>19.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>15.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td>4.01%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 1,273)
### 16. Coolidge: Please rate the current mix of land uses on Coolidge Highway between 11 Mile and 12 Mile Roads?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Too little</th>
<th>Just right</th>
<th>Too much</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>40.56%</td>
<td>49.27%</td>
<td>8.79%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>64.67%</td>
<td>29.98%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment venues (movie theaters,</td>
<td>49.96%</td>
<td>25.42%</td>
<td>20.66%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>night clubs, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional (governments, schools,</td>
<td>66.64%</td>
<td>7.89%</td>
<td>22.62%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>churches)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (including medical)</td>
<td>61.10%</td>
<td>14.02%</td>
<td>18.72%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple-family</td>
<td>34.84%</td>
<td>15.74%</td>
<td>34.34%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use (ex. 1st floor retail &amp; 2nd</td>
<td>33.18%</td>
<td>29.58%</td>
<td>26.14%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>floor office or residential)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 18. Woodward: Please rate the current mix of land uses on Woodward between 11 Mile and 12 Mile Roads?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Too little</th>
<th>Just right</th>
<th>Too much</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>35.39%</td>
<td>47.89%</td>
<td>14.20%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>43.41%</td>
<td>44.87%</td>
<td>10.27%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment venues (movie theaters,</td>
<td>44.89%</td>
<td>26.74%</td>
<td>26.08%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>night clubs, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional (governments, schools,</td>
<td>50.12%</td>
<td>39.44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>churches)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (including medical)</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>8.81%</td>
<td>24.63%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple-family</td>
<td>13.52%</td>
<td>44.86%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use (ex. 1st floor retail &amp; 2nd</td>
<td>27.95%</td>
<td>30.74%</td>
<td>37.79%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>floor office or residential)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/Industrial</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>35.80%</td>
<td>8.89%</td>
<td>45.76%</td>
<td>1,204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20. 11 Mile: Please rate the current mix of land uses on 11 Mile between Greenfield and Mortenson?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Too little</th>
<th>Just right</th>
<th>Too much</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>59.21%</td>
<td>23.59%</td>
<td>16.13%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>69.24%</td>
<td>15.01%</td>
<td>15.90%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment venues</td>
<td>46.49%</td>
<td>21.06%</td>
<td>30.14%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>11.36%</td>
<td>42.27%</td>
<td>42.36%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (including medical)</td>
<td>19.04%</td>
<td>38.09%</td>
<td>11.05%</td>
<td>31.82%</td>
<td>1,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple-family</td>
<td>18.44%</td>
<td>30.43%</td>
<td>8.80%</td>
<td>42.33%</td>
<td>1,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use (ex. 1st floor retail &amp; 2nd floor office or residential)</td>
<td>34.44%</td>
<td>24.58%</td>
<td>37.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/Industrial</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>33.03%</td>
<td>22.52%</td>
<td>33.95%</td>
<td>1,190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. 12 Mile: Please rate the current mix of land uses on 12 Mile between Greenfield and Woodward?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Too little</th>
<th>Just right</th>
<th>Too much</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>39.09%</td>
<td>52.55%</td>
<td>6.16%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>55.35%</td>
<td>38.78%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment venues</td>
<td>55.32%</td>
<td>26.35%</td>
<td>18.96%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>59.57%</td>
<td>11.43%</td>
<td>27.01%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (including medical)</td>
<td>48.14%</td>
<td>56.10%</td>
<td>13.01%</td>
<td>22.41%</td>
<td>1,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple-family</td>
<td>12.57%</td>
<td>35.39%</td>
<td>12.32%</td>
<td>39.72%</td>
<td>1,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use (ex. 1st floor retail &amp; 2nd floor office or residential)</td>
<td>34.05%</td>
<td>32.65%</td>
<td>28.21%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. Where would you support new development of the following land uses?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Coolidge</th>
<th>Woodward</th>
<th>11 Mile</th>
<th>12 Mile</th>
<th>Greenfield</th>
<th>Total Unique Responses</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Retail</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>1,169</td>
<td>3,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Restaurants</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>3,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Entertainment venues</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>2,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Institutional</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>1,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Office</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>2,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>2,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple-family</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>1,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/industrial</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>1,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No new development</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Multiple answers per participant possible. Percentages added may exceed 100 since a participant may select more than one answer for this question.

Other Considerations Analysis

Respondents were asked, “Is there anything else you would like to be considered in the Master Plan?” Participants shared the following ideas:

- Many expressed the sentiment that the Master Plan should concentrate on improving Berkley as opposed to changing Berkley. Others requested policies or programs to improve the appearance of the City overall.
- Several respondents requested a ban on new multiple-family buildings, while others asked that the Master Plan include improvements to single-family neighborhoods. Other respondents asked that the size of new single-family houses be limited.
Many asked for a greater variety in the business mix along 12 Mile and Coolidge, with many requests for a grocery store. Other participants asked for green space, better streetscapes (sidewalks and trees) and beautification projects in the downtown area.

Many respondents included recreation related requests, including a pool (indoor and/or outdoor), gym, track, improved parks, ice rink, dog park, sand volleyball, splash pad, water park. Some stated directly that they wanted these features in a new community center.

Many participants mentioned infrastructure in some way, from improved sewers to a 21st century power grid and better sidewalks. A few also mentioned a new or renovated City Hall.

Several participants asked that the bicycle lane be removed from Coolidge.

A few respondents mentioned a farmers market.

Several respondents asked that bonfires and/or fire pits be allowed.

Respondents had differing opinions on whether they wanted or did not want marijuana businesses.

Unique requests included a historic district on Coolidge and 12 Mile, a water bottle refilling station, and updates on controversial issues like the Community Center and LaSalette.

The survey also asked, “What specific geographic areas or subjects should be addressed as part of the Master Plan, which have not been mentioned in this survey?” Answers included:

- 12 Mile: gathering spot at Robina, road diet, beautification, concentrate retail/restaurant and office Buckingham to Coolidge, Dairy Queen needs more parking, better sidewalks and more trees, on-street parking between Greenfield and Wakefield, 2-3 story parking structure, more benches, bicycle racks
- Coolidge: eliminate bicycle lane, concentrate retail/restaurant and office 12 Mile to 11 Mile, better sidewalks, and more trees
- 11 Mile: better sidewalks and more trees
- Greenfield: better sidewalks and more trees, 200 bed Hospice care facility
- Catalpa: add bicycle lane, curbs, stop sign at Robina, multi-family
- LaSalette building
- Wiltshire
- City Hall: need to improve or replace.
- Traffic around Rogers School
- The cemetery: treat as a community asset
- Several participants mentioned drainage and flooding.
- A few respondents asked that code enforcement be improved.
- Many respondents asked for repairs to roads and sidewalks. Other asked for more planning of trails and sidewalks to link green spaces and parks in Berkley.
- Several participants mentioned more planning for parks, improvements to parks and the need for more park and green space.
Demographic Analysis

The respondent pool was generally representative of the City as a whole. The survey can be used as a credible resource, amongst many, when making decisions for the Master Plan. Comparative statistics are below:

- 94% of the respondents lived in a single-family home, statistically close to the U.S. Census estimates for the City of Berkley.
- 91% lived in an owner-occupied dwelling unit, higher than the estimated 78% of owner-occupied units per 2018 estimates in the American Community Survey by the U.S. Census.
- Respondents by age are within 5 percentage points as a proportion of the general Berkley population, except for respondents under 25 which was less than 2% of the City residents responding. Residents ages 15-24 are estimated to be almost 12% of Berkley’s population per 2018 estimates in the American Community Survey by the U.S. Census.
- Almost 86% of the respondents identified as white, statistically close to the U.S. Census estimates for the City of Berkley. The other categories were close as well.

1. What is your relationship to the City of Berkley? Input from all individuals is valuable, but please note that results may be analyzed by relationship to the City and place of residence. This question is required in order to advance to the rest of the survey. (select all that apply)

![Bar Chart]

(N = 1,314)

Note: Multiple answers per participant possible. Percentages added may exceed 100 since a participant may select more than one answer for this question. See verbatim report for “other” responses/
1a. How long have you lived in Berkley?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>4.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5 years</td>
<td>18.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
<td>16.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20 years</td>
<td>20.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30 years</td>
<td>16.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 30 years</td>
<td>24.36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 1,277)

1a. If you don’t live in Berkley, where do you live?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Woods</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Oak</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southfield</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Park</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td>83.57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 28)

Note: Multiple answers per participant possible. Percentages added may exceed 100 since a participant may select more than one answer for this question. See verbatim report for “other” responses.

2. Please select the term that best describes your residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-family house</td>
<td>54.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>5.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached condominium or duplex</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 1,304)

2a. Do you rent or own your place of residence?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own</td>
<td>51.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td>8.63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other: Dearborn Heights, senior building

Other: Parsonage (2), live in my parents (2), co own with relative
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28. What is your age?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>1.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34</td>
<td>14.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44</td>
<td>23.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 54</td>
<td>20.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 64</td>
<td>18.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>18.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>3.79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 1,267)

29. What is your racial or ethnic identity? (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial or Ethnic Identity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>85.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>9.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td>1.44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 1,248)

Note: Multiple answers per participant possible. Percentages added may exceed 100 since a participant may select more than one answer for this question.
### 30. Including yourself, how many people in your household are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Under age 2</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.42%</td>
<td>15.97%</td>
<td>10.50%</td>
<td>15.55%</td>
<td>7.56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Ages 3 - 5</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85.84%</td>
<td>14.16%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Ages 6 - 17</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.43%</td>
<td>39.05%</td>
<td>6.98%</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Ages 18 - 25</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65.14%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>6.29%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Ages 26 - 35</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45.80%</td>
<td>53.05%</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Ages 36 - 44</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48.42%</td>
<td>51.58%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Ages 45 - 54</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.00%</td>
<td>43.67%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Ages 55 - 64</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.55%</td>
<td>43.45%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Ages 65+</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65.66%</td>
<td>33.96%</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Information Analysis

Respondents stated they typically got their information about Berkley from the City website (63.34%) and social media (64.58%). The Steering Committee expressed concern that perhaps some residents who do not use electronic means for information were missed.
31. Where do you typically get your information about Berkley City and community affairs and programs? (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City website</td>
<td>63.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper/Public hearing notice</td>
<td>34.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Public meetings</td>
<td>15.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV/Radio</td>
<td>7.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of mouth</td>
<td>41.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>64.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td>13.87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 1,276)

Note: Multiple answers per participant possible. Percentages added may exceed 100 since a participant may select more than one answer for this question.
City of Berkley Master Plan
Focus Groups
Final Report

Carlisle Wortman Associates
Report Date: July 17, 2020
As part of the Berkley Master Plan update, CWA consultants facilitated eight focus groups. Two focus groups were conducted in person before the Shelter in Place order from the Governor of Michigan due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The remaining were conducted via Zoom in April-June. City staff set up the focus groups with the following stakeholders:

- Residents who regularly participate in planning and zoning matters, including former candidates for public office
- Members of City Boards and Commissions
- City staff
- Representatives from Berkley Schools administration
- Business owners
- Realtors and developers
- Young families
- Parents of Berkley High School students
- Pastors and staff from faith-based non-profits

The report below summarizes the responses to questions asked of all groups, with notes on when responses differed by group.

**What are Berkley's top three assets?**

Focus groups mentioned the following as Berkley’s top three assets (items with an asterisk were mentioned in multiple groups):

- Small town charm/feel*
- Sense of community*
- Family-Oriented*
- Good people*
- Walkability*
- Schools*
- Great location*
- Safety*
- Variety of shops/small businesses*
- Downtown with events*
- City services*
- Affordable homes*
- Recreation, including youth sports*
- Inclusive
- Accessibility
- Diversity, different religions and races
- Accessibility of downtown
- Library
- Future community center
- Eclectic building fabric that give the City a unique identity
- Diversity in the sizes of houses
- Historic Fire Hall
- Gazebo/War Memorial
- Public parks
- Businesses are up to sidewalk with parking behind
- Upscale residential properties
- No overnight parking allowed on residential streets
- Grid street pattern and layout
- Linear downtown
What could be improved?

The following improvements were offered (items with an asterisk were mentioned in multiple groups):

- The DDA or business district is too big.*
- Downtown, including fewer store vacancies and more variety of businesses and more work/live developments with more diversity and density*
- Sidewalks*
- Parking*
- Updated municipal buildings and better maintenance* (including suggestions for a city hall makeover with a large assembly room, upgrades to the existing community center)
- Zoning regulations that are less strict
- Add green infrastructure
- Overuse of pavement
- Connections between quadrants of the City (better crosswalk on major streets)
- More engaging outdoor spaces where people can sit and gather
- Take better care of the existing trees
- Missing middle housing
- Bike lane on Coolidge should be eliminated
- Road diet/bike land on Coolidge should be kept
- Communications as a whole: Sentiment that the situation is better but still could be improved.
- Upgrades to City Departments except for Public Safety and the Department of Public Works
- More for kids, especially ages 8 to 16, to do: community center, green space, parks, places to go, hang out, and summer camps.
- Make corridors more walkable.
- Updated facades on retail corridors.
- Wider sidewalks and more gathering spaces on Coolidge and 12 Mile
- Connectivity to other communities. Better planning and coordination with neighbors and the three communities that are part of the school district.
- Greenfield
- Better walkability to the downtown
- Build on grid pattern
- Library open on Sunday

What is missing?

Participants mentioned the following in response to what was missing (items with an asterisk were mentioned in multiple groups):

- Senior housing*
- Grocery store*
- Splash pad*
- Variety of restaurants
- Facilities Manager
- Physical connections between neighborhoods
- Bike parking
- Electric vehicle parking
- Downtown housing
- Downtown gathering place
- Affordable small-scale apartments
- Different types of housing
- Parking regulations that keep cars off residential streets
- Better sustainability for downtown and retail strips
- Right size the City
Parking at the High School, especially for big events
• Places for students and parents to wait or park at the High School
• Park space in the northeast quadrant of the City
• Good butcher shop*
• Good place to buy the essentials*
• Ordinance requiring no smoking in a building where oxygen is being used by an individual (relates to situation shared by resident in senior citizens focus group).
• Prioritize sidewalks first and roads for drivers second
• Connections to the cemetery
• Linear park by the cemetery
• Nothing
• Connectivity
• Mixed-use two-story buildings
• Coffee shop that is open later
• Entertainment options
• Brighter street lights on Woodward

What would you change? Don’t let reality constrain your answer. If a genie showed up and gave you three wishes for Berkley, what would you say

Changes shared were (items with an asterisk were mentioned in multiple groups) :

• Would not change anything*
• Negative perceptions*
• More money or resources*
• Brand new community center*, including request for teenage hang out space by young families focus group, ice arena, indoor pool and area for senior from the senior citizens focus group.
• Bring the Ice Arena back*
• No flooding*
• Berkley Theater is reopened*
• Everyone to work together better. Positive thinking about what is really happening.
• No vacancies in the downtown
• Vibrant downtown full of small independent stores and restaurants
• Signed bicycle route
• Expand sidewalk on the west side of Coolidge north to 12 Mile up to Webster
• Restrooms in every park and electricity.
• More private/public partnerships
• Update all the City’s facilities
• Sewer system fixed
• All roads nicely paved with fixed sidewalks
• Second floor for the library
• Expand the historical museum
• Daylight Red Run and other waterways
• Solar energy for municipal structures
• Park space with café/bar in park and band shell including public Wi-Fi and bike path through it
• Community wide wi-fi or high speed internet
• Return Coolidge to former configuration before the road diet
• Put parking behind all the businesses and schools
• Move all the businesses to the central core
• Park with entertainment space for concerts or farmers market
• Dedicated picnic area
• More trees
• Real development to fill vacant storefronts and parcels
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- Chamber of Commerce and DDA would work together
- More diverse and lively downtown area.
- Turn parking lots into places/green space and a focal point.
- Turn vacant lot on Dorothea into garden/park as community garden.
- Lofts on Coolidge.
- LaSallette preserved with an active use
- Redo the downtown from scratch: two stories buildings up to the curb with parking in back with brick wall in between that and neighborhoods.
- Move all the houses off Greenfield and make a commercial area.
- On 11 Mile, make a young vibe, apartment area with Oak Park.
- Make busses available for Berkley School students
- Brand new infrastructure, sewer, water, roads
- More land
- Better soil for all landscaping
- A double-wide driveway
- Fruit trees in his yard.
- Commandeer Beaumont from Royal Oak.
- Fix the housing diversity problem, with a sensitive way that everyone is ok with
- Land use solution for Greenfield

What do you think the main problem is for parking? What is your advice for us in having these conversations?

In terms of parking, we heard several issues, summarized below:

- City was built in 1923, when the number of vehicles in the City today was not expected.
- Signs and regulations are inconsistent and scattered. A comprehensive parking sign survey was suggested as well as policy changes including a parking district, shared parking, and no parking minimums.
- School pick and drop off causes parking problems for short periods of the time during school days.
- Need to right-size parking to make sure the appropriate amount is in each location. Regulations and zoning need to be changed to allow the right-sizing to happen.
- Some participants liked the overnight parking prohibition on residential streets while others wanted it eliminated or altered so overnight parking could happen either with a permit or on certain occasions.
- One participant suggested that the need for parking could be lessened by reducing the need for cars through micro-transit, more visible and attractive bus stops, and making people feel more comfortable using other transportation options.
- Other participants felt that parking was not a significant issue.
For housing? What is your advice for us in having these conversations?

On housing, participants shared the concerns listed below:

- Many participants shared stories about how an older neighbor had died or moved and the house was sold for a price that is well beyond a starter home price. Many were concerned about affordability and the ability of residents to move with Berkley to a bigger house or to senior housing.
- Overall, participants recognized that single-family housing is “at the heart of the community” but most saw the need for senior housing or other types of housing for young people as well. Suggestions included granny flats or accessory dwelling units, lofts on Coolidge, second-story living areas in the downtown and duplexes and triplexes integrated into neighborhoods. Overall, large apartment complexes were not desired, rather “missing middle” building that could be integrated into corridors and neighborhoods. Also, some participants wanted ranch or one-story single-family homes to be built.
- Some participants expressed their frustration trying to find an affordable home for a large family in Berkley.
- Many participants, including all of those in the senior citizen focus group, felt there was a need for more senior housing in Berkley beyond Oxford Towers.
- Many participants asked for ways to limit the size of new houses (height and footprint) and/or ways to assure a diversity of styles.

What do you hope Berkley is in 5 years? 10 years? 20 years?

Participants hopes for the Berkley of the future are listed below (items with an asterisk were mentioned in multiple groups):

- Like it how it is and hopes it stays the same*
- Keep the small town charm*
- A grocery store is in the City*
- Lofts*
- Senior housing*
- Keep our house prices are reasonable/affordable*
- All the vacancies downtown are filled and facades renovated*
- New community center*
- Three to four story development on 12 Mile and Coolidge.
- Different types of housing on Greenfield
- LED lights
- Sensible community center and city hall
- No flooding
- Berkley Theater is re-opened
- Parking is more consistent and available
- People trust government more
- The fundamental values of Berkley – community, family and looking out for one another – are still here.
- Continuing to grow as a great community with more diversity
- More parks
- Berkley grows gracefully
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- Responsible development with the proper scale, mixed use in the downtown, parking situation is solved.
- More accessible, more technology focused or open. Sharing lots of things already.
- More regional collaboration as a small city in a big region. Being connected and collaborative with the communities around us.
- Public transportation*
- Berkley with same character, just enhanced. It is like your grandmother’s silverware, that needs to be polished.
- Berkley holds its ethos.
- Keeping great neighborhoods and schools
- Expand how we make it accessible and expand public spaces in general.
- Downtown redeveloped but keeping the focus on the family.
- 12 Mile to Coolidge transformed: organized to what kind of businesses, a consistent look and feel, little parking, little green areas in the midst of what is going on.
- Mixed use housing on 12 Mile
- 12 Mile pedestrian aspect improved, speed & parking, via a road diet
- Give people a place to land and visit
- Community Center for everyone
- Closer to what Royal Oak is but still have the hometown feel
- Prosperous, safe, diverse. Attracting creative and intelligent people. People seem to want to live here.
- More gathering spots, more places to walk, gather, and eat outside
- Better, more vibrant, thoughtful change
- We keep up. Reporter from Detroit said that Berkley always has its nose pressed up on the glass of progress. Things in the future might not be the same as they are now. We don’t want to be “that community” (i.e. Royal Oak or Southfield or…) but doesn’t mean we cannot learn from them
- The perfectly planned city that the American Planning Association would be proud of
- Making it a welcoming community but planning forward for the new economy and the new individuals/families who want to move here
- Continue with the strong things that make it what it is
- Looking inward and outward. Look to have community coalition with Huntington Woods and Oak Park
- Small town feel, with big time reputation. Charm stays and stays current with the times
- Three phase approach to community center so it could be built in a responsible manner but meet the needs

What other ideas or suggestions do you have as Berkley undertakes a Master Plan process?

Suggestions shared by participants are below. These are paraphrased quotes:

- Do not respond only to the vocal minority
- Talk to business owners
- More than a pro forma talk with adjacent communities. Often, the edges are ignored.
- In the community engagement, talk to more than the usual suspects.
• Being progressive doesn’t mean it has to be big.
• Do not present unrealistic ideas
• Emphasize the importance of street trees. From a general quality of life, it cannot be overstated.
• Things to look at and look outside of the box and where there might be grant funding with different or alternative technology.
• Rethinking on street yards – rain gardens or bioswales. Royal Oak has rain garden in the park.
• Create a vibrant downtown, that is full on every weekend.
• Be Berkley. Berkley tries to get past what is it. Would like it to be cleaner, but cannot be those other communities (Royal Oak, Birmingham), because it is not set up that way. We are still a community and can allow change.
• Create a document that represents the community. One of the challenges that the City will face is the threat it represents and build the consensus and taken away the measure of fear. Creating that shield of legitimacy is important. Some come from those who have time and don’t have time and it leads to the loudest voices in the room dominating. Have opportunities to be involved and not on a schedule, throughout the process. Release the raw data from the survey, not just aggregate.
• Berkley does a nice job with being a small city.
• Healthy food restaurants. No more pizza, no more fast food.
• Need for detailed plan, but great if there is a quick summary of all the major points
• Make sure all elements are covered and fill in the holes: parks and schools and community center and housing and infrastructure. Make it easy to use.
• Look at vacant spaces. Parcels and parks that can be special and unique as a node or point of destination. How can we experience the City differently?
• Part of the 36 square mile former township: look at other municipalities in the box on the map as a network of assets instead of competitions
• People in Berkley don’t leave and if they do, they come back. Tap into that passion and then people will participate.
MEMORANDUM

To: Berkley Planning Commission
From: Erin Schlutow, Community Development Director
Subject: Parking Requirement Modification during Site Plan Review
Date: July 20, 2020

Per our conversation at last month’s meeting, I have reviewed ordinances of several surrounding and comparable communities in southeast Michigan to analyze how other municipalities have permitted the Planning Commission to grant off-street parking modifications or deviations from the Zoning Ordinance during site plan review. I have also included an analysis on the three most recent site plans that were reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission and the numerical parking reduction that would have been applicable in each case. They include: KinderCare (1695 Twelve Mile), AquaTots (2485 Coolidge), and La Salette (2219 Coolidge).

As we have previously discussed, it is common for a planning commission to have the authority to modify a parking requirement during the site plan review process. It would be the responsibility of the applicant to make such request and demonstrate and provide evidence that the parking requirement in the Zoning Ordinance does not fit the proposed use of the building.

Modifications of parking requirements during site plan review

The long, narrow design of the commercial corridors with shallow parcels has been problematic for potential business owners looking to make a home in Berkley. Oftentimes, the size of the properties does not allow for the required minimum on-site parking to serve each individual business. While there are provisions in the Zoning Ordinance that permits shared parking agreements between properties as well as eliminating parking requirements for properties within 500 ft. of a municipal parking lot, there are still issues that are hindering occupancy of vacant commercial properties.

I recommend discussing an ordinance amendment that would give the Planning Commission the authority to grant modifications or deviations to parking requirements during site plan review. This flexible approach to development can provide business owners opportunities in Berkley that may have been deemed too difficult in the past.

Requests for parking requirement modifications would encourage an applicant to review and analyze the proposed project and think critically about alternatives that would benefit the community. It has proven a useful tool in other communities where land for development is scarce and has garnered positive pedestrian and bicycle transit opportunities. Communities have approached the topic of off-street parking modification request in different ways.
**Community Comparison**
Below is a table summary of what is permitted by surrounding and comparable communities. The full ordinance text for each community is provided in separate letter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Approval</th>
<th>Determination to Modify Numerical Parking Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clawson</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>CMD-1 District Only&lt;br&gt;Seven (7) standards of review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferndale</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>Five (5) standards of review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazel Park</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>Evidence that there will be lower demand for parking due to one of four factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Orion</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>May grant lesser number of parking spaces as part of a shared parking between multiple uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon Township</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>Evidence that another standard would be more reasonable, due to level of current or future employment, level of current or future customer traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Heights</td>
<td>Site Plan Review Committee</td>
<td>Surplus parking “land banked” and banked area to be landscaped. To be constructed as parking if needed in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>Evidence that another standard would be more reasonable, due to level of current or future employment, level of current or future customer traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Hills</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>Evidence that another standard would be more reasonable because of the level of current or future employment or customer traffic. May attach conditions of approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Oak</td>
<td>Zoning Administrator Planning Commission</td>
<td>Minimum parking requirements deemed excessive for use. No more than 10% of the required parking may be waived. Does not run with land.&lt;br&gt;Land banking up to 20% of required parking spaces through special land use process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>Evidence that sufficient number of parking spaces are provided to accommodate characteristics of the intended use, usually a parking study. May be considered separately with no other concurrent request (site plan review)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As noted above, every community has a different approach as to how to allow such requests. Some require the applicant to satisfy specific standards related to the request (Ferndale, Clawson), and others have left it fairly open to allow the applicant to make their case to the PC (Lyon, Plymouth, Hazel Park).

However, not every community allows for a modification of off-street parking requirements within the Zoning Ordinance. Birmingham, Southfield, and Oak Park do not allow for such deviations.

**Off-Street Parking Modification Examples**

One of the concerns regarding a parking modification is a limit or cap to the number or percentage allowed to be reduced. During our previous discussions, a 10% cap was suggested. The City Attorney has reviewed the language and has also suggested a numerical or percentage cap.

In order to provide context to the requests, below is a summary of the parking requirements and potential parking modification requests based on a 10% maximum modification. Please note, the below table demonstrates the maximum allowable spaces to be reduced and does not indicate that the maximum reduction would be permitted in each case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Required Parking</th>
<th>Parking Provided</th>
<th>Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KinderCare Bldg. also includes office and medical office</td>
<td>1695 Twelve Mile Rd</td>
<td>185 spaces</td>
<td>121 spaces on-site + shared parking agreement</td>
<td>19 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AquaTots Development includes two retail and one restaurant with outdoor dining</td>
<td>2485 Coolidge</td>
<td>74 spaces</td>
<td>77 spaces</td>
<td>7 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Salette Residential 55 units; 7 studio 41 one-bedroom 7 two-bedroom</td>
<td>2219 Coolidge</td>
<td>108 spaces</td>
<td>109 spaces</td>
<td>11 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While each of the above cases may not have warranted granting a parking modification request, it would be beneficial to have the opportunity to review such requests and determine whether it would be better suited for a development and a community to have additional green space or buffer area between residential properties than to meet the parking requirement.
Summary

Any request for a parking modification would be thoroughly vetted by city staff prior to review by Planning Commission to determine the feasibility and practicality of such request. It is not the intent to reduce parking requirements across the community, as that would undermine the authority of the parking standards in the Zoning Ordinance. The ability to modify or deviate off-street parking requirements, in limited circumstances, gives some flexibility for development in the community with the intended opportunity to enhance the aesthetic appeal of the property.

I have included proposed language for the Zoning Ordinance text amendment that would grant the Planning Commission the authority to modify parking requirements. If the Planning Commission would like to move forward, as proposed, we would request agreement to set the public hearing for the August 25, 2020 meeting.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Erin Schlutow
Community Development Director
MEMORANDUM

To: Berkley Planning Commission

From: Erin Schlutow, Community Development Director

Subject: Community Comparison – Parking Modifications

Date: July 20, 2020

Lyon Township – Section 14.01(C)(8)

Minimum number of spaces for each use. The amount of required off-street parking space shall be determined in accordance with the schedule. The planning commission may modify the numerical requirements for off-street parking, based on evidence that another standard would be more reasonable, because of the level of current or future employment and/or level of current or future customer traffic.

City of Ferndale – Section 24-223(g)

Reduction of parking requirements. The planning commission may reduce the parking requirements based upon a finding that there will be a lower demand for parking due to one or more of the following factors:

1. Shared parking by multiple uses with peak parking demands during differing times of the day or days of the week;
2. Convenient municipal off-street parking or on-street spaces are located within 500 feet that have the capacity to handle additional parking;
3. Expectation of walk-in business due to sidewalk connections to adjacent residential neighborhoods or employment centers. The site design incorporates pedestrian connections to the site and on-site pedestrian circulation providing safe and convenient access to the building entrance;
4. Availability of other forms of travel such as transit. The planning commission may require that the site design incorporates transit stops, pedestrian connections to nearby transit stops or enhanced bicycle parking facilities;
5. The applicant has provided a parking study, conducted by a qualified traffic engineer, that demonstrates that another standard would be more appropriate based on actual number of employees, expected level of customer traffic or actual counts at a similar establishment. The planning commission may require a
parking study to document that any one of the criteria (1) through (4) above would be met.

**City of Clawson – Section 34-1071(6)**

*Modification of off-street parking requirements.* Parking requirements as established in section 34-1074 may be modified by the planning commission within the CMD-1 district only:

a. Collective parking arrangements are in effect between the applicant and the owner of another property for customer parking during nonoverlapping hours;
b. Parking may exist during the same business hours, and there is no immediate impact on the surrounding properties;
c. The particular site plan under consideration involves a first floor use in a multiple-story building in which other uses exist which do not conflict nor impose a burden on the parking demands or requirements under consideration;
d. The particular use subject to site plan review is in a nonconforming structure to a conforming use the parking for which creates no substantial impact on surrounding properties;
e. A contract agreement as allowed by section 34-1147 has been entered into by the applicant with the city and is to be a condition to site plan approval;
f. There exists a development agreement that takes into consideration on a temporary basis, parking for the affected site.
g. Subsection 34-1146(d) permits the planning commission to modify the parking requirements for first-floor uses within a multiple-story building and a single-story structure where certain conditions have been satisfied.

**Village of Lake Orion – Section 14.01(A)(7)**

*Shared Parking.* Nothing in this Section shall be construed to prevent collective provision of off-street parking facilities for two (2) or more buildings or uses, provided such off-street parking facilities collectively shall not be less than the sum of the requirements for the individual uses computed separately. The uses that share parking facilities may be located within a single building or in separate buildings located on the same or different sites.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Planning Commission may, in its discretion, approve a lesser number of parking spaces based upon the following:

a. *Computation.* The number of shared parking spaces required for two or more land uses sharing a parking lot or located on the same parcel of land shall be determined by the following procedure:

i. Multiply the minimum parking required for each individual use, as set forth in Table 14.02, by the appropriate percentage indicated in Table 14.01 for each of the six (6) designated time periods.

ii. Add the resulting sums for each of the six (6) columns.
iii. The minimum parking requirement shall be the highest sum along the six (6) columns resulting from the above calculations.

b. *Other Uses.* If one or all of the land uses proposing to make use of shared parking facilities do not conform to the general land use classifications in Table 14.02, as determined by the Planning Commission, the applicant shall submit sufficient data to include the principal operating hours of the uses. Based upon this information, the Planning Commission shall determine the appropriate shared parking requirement, if any, for such uses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 14.01 – Shared Parking Calculations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential/Motel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Any uses proposing to share parking shall be subject to the provisions of 14.01.A.5 and 6, above.

d. A written agreement between joint users in a recordable form approved by the Village shall be filed with the Oakland County Register of Deeds and a copy shall be provided to the Village. The agreement shall assure the continued availability of the parking facility for the uses it is intended to serve.

e. A site that has been approved for a reduced shared parking standard shall not change to another use or combination of uses without review and approval of the Planning Commission.

**Royal Oak – Section 770-106(D)**

*Flexibility in application.* The City recognizes that, due to the specific requirements of any given development, inflexible application of the parking standards set forth in Section 770-107, Table of Off-Street Parking Requirements, may result in development with inadequate parking or parking in far excess of that which is needed. The former situation may lead to traffic congestion or unauthorized parking on adjacent streets or neighboring sites. The latter situation may result in
excessive paving and stormwater runoff, depreciation of aesthetic standards, and a waste of space, which could be left as open space.

(1) **Waiver based on use.** The Zoning Administrator may grant a waiver in cases where the applicant has sufficiently demonstrated that the minimum parking requirements of Section 770-107, Table of Off-Street Parking Requirements, are excessive for their use. Such waivers may be approved if no more than 10% of the required parking per Section 770-107, Table of Off-Street Parking Requirements, is being waived. The approved waivers shall apply only to the current site use, and shall not be carried over to another use or occupant of the site.

(2) **Land banking.** The Plan Commission may permit land banking up to 20% of the required parking spaces through the special land use review process. Sufficient land shall be available in the case that the Plan Commission determines the banked spaces need to be constructed based on observed usage. After such determination, banked parking spaces shall be constructed within six months of written notification by the Zoning Administrator. Such land banking requests shall require special land use approval, subject to the requirements of Section 770-11, Special land uses; permit procedures, and the posing of an appropriate bond in an amount to be established by the Zoning Administrator or his designee.

**City of Plymouth – Section 78-270(10)**

Parking requirements within the B-2 central business district.

(c) The planning commission or city commission may, at their discretion, modify the numerical requirements for off-street parking, based on evidence provided by the applicant that indicates that another standard would be more reasonable because of the level of current or future employment and/or the level of current or future customer traffic. The planning commission or city commission may consider parking standards such as the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) or other documented parking standards or studies, including shared parking/collective parking arrangements and/or peak/non-peak parking demand. The planning commission or city commission may also consider prior arrangements or written agreements established before December 31, 2011, which satisfies required parking for the downtown or B-2 zoning district.

**City of Rochester Hills – Section 138-202**

*Modification of Parking Requirements.* The Planning Commission may modify the numerical requirements for off-street parking based on evidence submitted by the applicant that another standard would be more reasonable because of the level of current or future employment or customer traffic.

The Planning Commission may attach conditions to the approval of a modification of the requirements of Section 138-11.204 that bind such approval to the specific use in question.
City of Hazel Park – Section 17.28.040(B)

Reduction of Parking Requirements. The Planning Commission may reduce parking requirements based upon a finding that there will be a lower demand for parking due to one (1) of the following factors:

1. Shared parking by multiple uses with peak parking demands during different times of the day, days of the week, or parts of the year.
2. Expectation of walk-in business due to sidewalk connections to adjacent residential neighborhoods or employment centers. Site design shall incorporate pedestrian connections to the site that provide safe and convenient access to the building entrance.
3. Availability of other forms of transit. The Planning Commission may require that the site design incorporate transit stops, pedestrian connections to transit stops, or enhanced bicycle parking facilities.
4. Special provision is made for applying the standards of this chapter to developed sites which existed prior to the adoption of this chapter. In determining whether or not a site can comply, the Planning Commission shall consider reducing parking requirements based upon the following:
   a. The proposed use of the site;
   b. The existing parking and building(s) at the site; and
   c. Whether the requirements for parking, as determined by the Planning Commission, are unduly burdensome.

City of Madison Heights – Section 10.505(10)

All occupancies shall provide for the minimum number of off-street parking spaces as determined by type of use in accordance with the following schedule. If it is determined during the site plan review process that the proposed use may require less parking that that required by ordinance, the surplus parking area may be shown as “banked” on the plan, subject to approval of the site plan review committee. The parking area saved by reducing the number of space (“banked spaces”) shall be landscaped. If at any time the city determines that part or all of the banked spaces are required to provide adequate parking, the community development department shall notify the property owner, who shall construct said spaces within 90 days of notification of the determination, or as established by the site plan review committee due to seasonal conditions.

City of Troy – Section 13.06(F)

Flexibility in Application.

1. The City recognizes that, due to the specific requirements of any given development, inflexible application of the parking standards may result in development with inadequate parking or parking far in excess of that which is needed. The former
situation may lead to traffic congestion or unauthorized parking on adjacent streets or neighboring sites. The latter situation may result in excessive paving and stormwater runoff and a waste of space which could be left as open space. Projects with Prequalified Sustainable Development Project (SDP) status are automatically eligible for a parking deviation, provided the measures proposed for SDP status are so qualified for that purpose.

2. The City may grant deviations from off-street parking requirements. These deviations may require more or less parking based upon a finding that such deviations are more likely to provide a sufficient number of parking spaces to accommodate the specific characteristics of the use in question. In the event that a deviation is granted, the following shall apply:
   a. An applicant may request a parking deviation as part of a development application or as a separate and district action with no other concurrent request.
   b. The applicant shall provide a parking study with adequate detail and information to assist the City in determining the appropriateness of the request.
   c. A parking deviation may be included in an action on a concurrent request or be made separately by resolution.
   d. The City may attach conditions to the approval of a deviation from the off-street parking requirements that bind such approval to the specific use in question.
   e. The City may require the applicant to set aside area for reserve parking (landbanking) that can be constructed as needed, although this is not a prerequisite for the approval or a deviation. Where an area is set aside for reserve parking, it shall be easily developed, not devoted to a use other than open space, and shall be designed to accommodate attendant facilities such as maneuvering lanes and drainage.

3. It is the intent of this Ordinance to minimize excessive areas of pavement which reduces aesthetic standards and contributes to high rates of storm water runoff. Exceeding the minimum parking space requirements by more than twenty percent (20%) shall only be allowed with approval by the City. In granting such additional space, the City shall determine that such parking will be required, based on documented evidence, to accommodate the use on a typical day.
Sec. 138-226 - Parking Requirement Modification.

An applicant for site plan approval may request the Planning Commission to consider modifying the numerical parking requirements for off-street parking applying to the proposed use, based upon evidence provided by the applicant that indicates that another parking standard would be more appropriate for the proposed use.

Any flexibility from the ordinance standard is tied to the specific use and site plan approved and will cease to exist once the use on the site terminates or changes to another use. The Planning Commission may grant a parking modification up to 10% of the total parking requirement for a particular use, as noted in Section 138-219.

The Planning Commission may have the discretion to grant or deny the requested modification, in limited circumstances, based on consideration of the following factors, as applicable:

a. Current or future levels of employees and/or patrons;
b. Peak period usage versus normal usage;
c. Banked or reserved parking for future use;
d. Opportunities to accommodate green space, additional landscaping and the minimization of impervious areas on the site;
e. Provision of valet parking or other means of accommodating patrons on a private lot that does not burden public parking. Further, submission of proof that such valet parking is available for the days and times noted and not in conflict with other businesses using the same valet facility;
f. Neighborhood or other surrounding characteristics unique to the property justify the requested deviation;
g. Strict application of the ordinance would prevent ability to develop the site as proposed for a permitted use and that an alternate parking calculation would be appropriate;
h. Modification will not impact or negatively affect public parking in the city;
i. Proximity of the site to local or regional transit, including but not limited to SMART bus stops, bicycle sharing stations, lite rail, etc.

Any planning commission modification under this section shall be contingent on the use of the property continuing as approved. Any change in the use, scope or intensity of the property use will result in the standard parking requirements being applied.
MEMORANDUM

To: Berkley Planning Commission

From: Erin Schlutow, Community Development Director

Subject: Projects Requiring Site Plan Approval

Date: July 20, 2020

In some of our earlier discussions this year, it was noted that it would be beneficial to discuss the standards and projects that require site plan approval; Division 7 Site Plan Review of Article VI Administration and Enforcement in the Berkley Zoning Ordinance.

In reviewing the language, I have noted several items that should be addressed and discussed:

Section 138-677

1. **Eleven Mile District was not included in the development list requiring site plan review.**
   This was discussed at the previous meeting and was agreed that it would be included in proposed language. The attached proposed language has been revised so as to require site plan approval for all projects that are not located in single family residential zoning districts.

2. **The inclusion of additional parking should be clarified. Perhaps a threshold of how many spaces added would trigger Planning Commission review. Review by DPW would be required.**

   This was discussed and it was requested for city staff to provide comparison of neighboring communities.

   a. **City of Clawson** – The ZO does not specifically call out requirement for site plan approval for paving of parking areas or how many spaces would qualify for site plan review. However, the requirements for development in the community are very strict, including site plan review for every change of use or reoccupancy in existing structures.

   b. **City of Oak Park** – The ZO does not specify site plan approval for paving parking areas.

   c. **City of Royal Oak** – Any paving at all requires Planning Commission review and approval.

   d. **City of Troy** – Any paving at all requires Planning Commission review and approval.
3. Façade alterations including change in material and size or number of windows is in contrast with Section 138-678 (2). This should be revised to prevent confusion with applicants or property owners.

Façade change – if any one façade is 50% change or more – PC review
Increase in number or size of windows – can be approved by staff
Decrease in size or number of windows – PC review

Section 138-678

1. Façade alterations changing surface material does not specify if that is one façade or the entire structure.

If any one façade is changed 50% or more, PC review would be required

2. Increase in number and size of windows is in contract with Section 138-677, as noted above.

Increase in number or size of windows – can be approved by city staff

3. Accessory structures are typically reviewed administratively

Accessory structures located within residential districts do not require PC review and approval.

Additionally, it may be prudent to review additional sections of the Site Plan Review process, under Chapter 138, Article VI, Division 7. Suggestions include:

Sec. 138-682 – Revisions

The Zoning Ordinance allows for a previously approved site plan to be revised, however, it is recommended to determine if some revisions can be approved administratively. If so, it is necessary to include parameters for revisions that can be approved administratively (minor) and those that should be approved by the Planning Commission (major).

Some minor revisions to an approved site plan may include:

1. additions or alterations to the landscape plan or landscape materials
2. relocation or additional screening of trash enclosure
3. alterations to the internal parking layout of the off-street lot, etc.
The construction of a new building or structure, adding or deleting parking or the addition of curb cuts onto a public road would not be considered minor and would require return to Planning Commission.

Sec. 138-684 – Conformity

The Zoning Ordinance does not allow extensions to a site plan approved by the Planning Commission. As a way to show flexibility to work with property owners, I would recommend an applicant may submit a request for site plan extension, subject to approval by the Planning Commission.

This would allow for an extension of a project, but would require the applicant to appear in person, wherein the PC can inquire about the reason for delays and anticipated construction timeline. The request for site plan extension should be submitted to Planning Commission prior to the expiration date of the site plan.

The number of allowed site plan extensions can be determined by the Planning Commission. Some communities allow for a one-time only, one-year extension, while others allow for two, one-year extensions.

Administrative Review by Zoning Administrator

During the course of our discussion at the February meeting, it was noted that the Zoning Ordinance does not contain a reference to the Zoning Administrator’s ability to determine that the size, scope, intensity of a project should be sent to Planning Commission for review and approval. In the course of the revisions to Division 7, it would be beneficial to include specific language that gives the Zoning Administrator the discretion to determine if a project should be sent to the Planning Commission, even if an administrative review is applicable by ZO standards.

That being said, the Zoning Administrator would not have the discretion to administratively review and approve a project that is specifically noted as requiring site plan approve by the Planning Commission.

For the purpose of the July 20, 2020 meeting, I have included the entirety of Chapter 138, Article VI, Division 7 for review and some sample language.

Sincerely,

Erin Schlutow
Community Development Director
DIVISION 7. - SITE PLAN REVIEW

Sec. 138-676. - Purpose.

(a) The intent of this division is to provide for consultation and cooperation between the applicant and the planning commission, so that both parties might realize maximum utilization of land and minimum adverse effects upon the surrounding area.

(b) It is hereby recognized that peculiarities of lot contour, existing and potential development of adjacent properties and existing and potential traffic and pedestrian circulation patterns require a flexibility in the location of buildings, open spaces, parking lots and driveways that cannot be achieved by detailed specifications. It is therefore required that all development within the districts listed in section 138-677 be submitted to the planning commission for its review and approval prior to the issuance of building permits. Nothing contained in this section is intended to allow a greater density of population nor less required open space than that which is specified.

Sec. 138-677. - Applicability.

(a) Any development in the following zoning districts shall require site plan review: not located in single family residential districts shall require site plan review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-M</td>
<td>Multiple-family residential district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-M-H</td>
<td>High-rise multiple-family residential district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenfield district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Downtown district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community centerpiece district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>Local business district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gateway district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coolidge district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Twelve mile district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woodward district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industrial district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-1</td>
<td>Parking district</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cemetery district

(b) Site plan review is also required for development of all institutional uses permitted in single-family districts such as, but not limited to: churches, schools and public facilities.

(c) Development requiring site plan review shall include:
   (1) Construction of a building;
   (2) Structural alteration of a building that includes adding floor area or height to the building;
   (3) Additional parking;
   (4) Façade alterations that include any 50% or more change in the exterior surface material of any one facade of a building or changes in the size or number of windows.
   (5) Façade alterations that reduce the size and/or number of windows.

Sec. 138-678. - Administrative review.

Administrative review for site plan review shall be conducted by the building department in cases where:
   (1) The façade alterations do not change the surface material more than 50% of any one façade.
   (2) The number or size of the windows are increasing in size.
   (3) The structure requiring site plan review is an accessory structure. An accessory structure must conform to site standards according to ch. 138, article III, division 1 of the Berkley Code of Ordinances. Accessory structures located within single residential districts do not require Planning Commission review and approval.

During administrative review, the building official and city planner shall act as the planning commission in determining compliance with the standards for approval. If the building official and city planner do not agree, then the application is denied. If the property owner is not satisfied with the administrative review, the property owner may take the application to the planning commission for site plan review.

The Zoning Administrator may have the discretion to request site plan review and approval by the Planning Commission, based on the size, scope and/or intensity of a proposed project. The applicant shall be responsible for providing all required information for site plan approval.

Sec. 138-679. - Standards.

The site plan shall be reviewed and approved by the planning commission upon finding that:
   (1) The site meets the requirements of this Code.
   (2) The proposed development does not create adverse effects on public utilities, roads, or sidewalks.
   (3) Pedestrian and vehicular areas are designed for safety, convenience, and compliment adjacent site design.
(4) Site design, architecture, signs, orientation, and materials are consistent with the city's master plan objectives and the design of the neighboring sites and buildings.

(5) Landscaping, lighting, dumpster enclosures, and other site amenities are provided where appropriate and in a complementary fashion.

(6) Site engineering has been provided to ensure that existing utilities will not be adversely affected.

Sec. 138-680. - Required information.

The following information shall be included on the site plan for final review, unless waived by the planning commission. The site plan shall be to a reasonable scale and indicate:

(1) Seal of architect and/or engineer who prepared plans.

(2) An appropriate descriptive legend, including north arrow, scale, legal description and the names and addresses of the architect or engineer responsible for the preparation of the site plan.

(3) The existing (and proposed) zoning.

(4) Location and size of all structures (including location of entrances and loading points).

(5) All outside dimensions of each structure, its distance from the property lines, its area and its height.

(6) With multiple-family residential proposals, the number and location of one-bedroom units, two-bedroom units, etc., and include typical floor plans with square feet of floor areas.

(7) Recorded and measured dimensions of all lot lines and location and design of all lots.

(8) Adjacent property's structures, uses, zoning and other significant features of the community, where appropriate (using a location sketch).

(9) Location of all existing and proposed drives and parking areas including types of surfacing, parking layout and dimensions.

(10) Dimensions of road widths and rights-of-way.

(11) All existing easements and vacated easements and rights-of-way.

(12) All required minimum setbacks (from the existing or proposed right-of-way from adjacent properties).

(13) Locations of lawns and landscaped areas, types and number of species, and how the landscaping is to be accomplished.

(14) Locations, sizes, and types of existing trees over four inches in diameter (before and after proposed development).

(15) Location and type of outside lighting, include site and fixture photometrics.

(16) All proposed screen and freestanding architectural walls, including typical cross-sections and the heights above ground on both sides of walls.

(17) Elevation drawings of all existing and proposed buildings on the site drawn to a scale of one inch equals four feet, or to another scale adequate to determine compliance with this chapter and to provide any other information needed to evaluate the overall site design on the basis of the criteria set forth in this section.

(18) Color and type of façade materials.
Stormwater engineering including: existing and proposed grading of the site, location of existing and proposed utilities, stormwater calculations for a 100-year storm, the drainage area on site that will detain the 10-year storm, and a profile of the sanitary sewer.

Sec. 138-681. - Approval process.

(a) Sketch plan (optional). An item may be submitted to the planning commission for informal discussion. No approval shall be granted. However, the applicant may wish to present and discuss a proposed project and any anticipated problems before applying for site plan approval.

(b) Site plan approval.

(1) An application for site plan approval shall be submitted to the city planning commission on such forms and containing such information that the planning commission shall prescribe.

(2) The planning commission is hereby authorized to approve, approve with conditions, or deny all site plans submitted under this chapter.

(3) Approval may be issued by the planning commission, subject to the applicant receiving board of appeals variances, as required by the zoning chapter.

(4) Each action taken with reference to site plan review and approval shall be duly recorded in the minutes of the planning commission and shall state the grounds for the action taken upon each site plan submitted for its approval.

Sec. 138-682. - Revisions.

An applicant for site plan approval may wish to revise a previously approved site plan. A site plan outlining the differences in the original approved site plan and the requested changes shall be submitted to the city. The approval process shall be similar to that outlined above. If the revised site plan is denied, the applicant may develop the site plan as originally approved or appeal the matter as outlined below.

If a change is deemed to be minor in scope or intensity, the revised site plan may be approved administratively. Such minor revisions may include:

1. Additions or alterations to the landscape plan or landscape materials
2. Relocation or additional screening of trash enclosure
3. Alterations to the internal parking layout of the off-street parking lot, restriping, etc.

Any major revisions to the site plan, as determined by the Zoning Administrator, shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning Commission.

Sec. 138-683. - Appeals.

An applicant for site plan approval shall have the right of appeal to the zoning board of appeals, and in such cases, the board may reverse, affirm or modify the action of the planning commission by the concurring vote of two-thirds of the members of the board.

Sec. 138-684. - Conformity.

When an applicant receives final site plan approval, the site shall be developed in complete conformity with the approved site plan, except as provided for under Revisions and Appeals. The site plan...
approval shall be valid for a period of 12 months. If a building permit is not procured and construction begun within that time, the site plan approval becomes null and void. No time extension to the site plan approval shall be granted.

A site plan shall be valid for a period of one year from date of final site plan approval. An applicant may request up to two one-year extensions, to be reviewed and granted by the Planning Commission. The request for site plan extension must be submitted in writing to the Community Development Department prior to the expiration of the site plan. Upon request, the applicant shall provide a proposed timeline for the proposed project or development.

Sec. 138-685. - Site maintenance.

The city planning commission shall not approve any site plan under this chapter unless and until the applicant signs a site maintenance agreement in a form approved by city council.