Planning Commission Work Session

AGENDA

Tuesday, December 1, 2020
7:00 – 8:30 P.M.

1. Check in

2. Action to Date
   a. Updated Schedule
   b. Master Plan Draft Chapters
   c. Revised Future Land Use Map

3. Focus items
   a. Neighborhoods

4. Next Steps
   a. Focus items continued (Systems)
   b. Drafting Master Plan sections
   c. Next meeting: Tuesday, January 5, 2021
   d. Thank you!
In this ever changing times, we hope this memo finds you and your family healthy, happy, and safe! We are looking forward to monthly Master Plan workshops with you next week and the early part of 2021. These meetings replace the multi-day workshops originally in the Master Plan process, but unable to be held due to the pandemic.

We will use the same format for these workshops as we do with the Master Plan Steering Committee:

- **Check in:** At the start of every workshop, we will ask the group a question, designed to help us as facilitators. The intent may be different each time, ranging from breaking the ice before a heavy discussion or to get a read of where each of you stand on an issue.

- **Action to Date:** We will update you on what has occurred between workshops and at the Master Plan Steering Committee meetings. Often, we will present revised documents and ask for discussion during this part of the workshop.

- **Focus Items:** We will use this portion of the workshop for meaty discussion on focus discussion items. 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. See the updated schedule for when we anticipate addressing each focus item. The cover memorandum for each workshop, sent to you no later than the Friday before the workshop, will contain background information and discussion questions on focus items. We thank you for taking the time to digest and ponder the information about focus items before each workshop.

- **Next Steps:** We will preview subjects for the next workshop, share our work schedule for the next month and reiterate the next workshop date in this final portion of the meeting.

The rest of this memo covers the subject matter for your December workshop: updated Master Plan schedule, draft chapter of the Master Plan, a Future Land Use Map and description and Neighborhoods as a focus issue.
Updated Schedule

An updated schedule is attached. The two multi-day workshops in the original timeline usually shorten a Master Plan process by four to six months. Since we were unable to hold those workshops and needed additional time, the Master Plan is now expected to be adopted in August or September of 2021. We welcome any suggestions you have on the schedule.

Master Plan Draft Chapters

Attached are draft Background and Vision, Mission, Values chapters of the Master Plan, revised per comments from the Master Plan Steering Committee. We will reserve 10 minutes of the workshop to discuss the draft. Please flag any formatting and/or typographical errors and send them to Erin via e-mail. We would appreciate your input on bigger picture items such as the overall image of the document, the order of chapters, and what is missing or needs to be changed.

Revised Future Land Use Map

Per input from you and the Steering Committee, we have revised the Future Land Use approach and map in the following ways:

- **Institutional FLU Category:** We added an institutional land use category, which was placed on areas not shown as parks currently zoned Community Centerpiece.

- **Green/Transitional Buffer FLU Category:** We removed the dotted line and created a future land use category of Green/Transitional Buffer in its place. The Steering Committee generally supported this change.

- **Elimination of Opportunity FLU Category:** Per advice of the Steering Committee and the Planning Commission, we eliminated this propose FLU category and made the LaSallette parcels not bordering Coolidge multiple-family.

- **Multiple-Family Category:** When comparing the Zoning Map to the draft Future Land Use map, we noticed areas that were zoned multiple family but not planned multiple family. We changed those areas to multiple family on the draft Future Land Use Map: the southern block faces of Princeton between Berkley and Henley and areas to the west of Coolidge, between Catalpa and Columbia. Those areas do not necessarily correspond to existing multiple family (see the attached map that shows areas zoned for multiple family and areas where multiple family have been built).

  In discussion with the Steering Committee, they suggested the following:

    - The areas to the west of Coolidge, between Catalpa and Columbia may be appropriate for attached or multiple-family housing, increasing in density closer to Coolidge. However, they felt your input was needed.
Some Steering Committee members felt that Oxford Towers should be a separate high density multiple-family category, since it was unlikely that a building of that size would be built in Berkley again. In the discussion, Steering Committee members held a variety of views of what should happen to that property if for some reason it had to be redeveloped. Your insight as to the vision for this property, if the building remains as is or in a redevelopment scenario, would be helpful.

We would appreciate your input on the following questions:

1. Is the Green/Transitional Buffer future land use category the most appropriate way to show potential corridor expansion? Other option would be to extend the corridor future land use category to these parcels. If not one of these two options, what other method should be used?

2. How should the area west of Coolidge, between Catalpa and Columbia, that is zoned multiple-family be planned?

3. Should Oxford Towers be planned as a different multiple-family future land use category that other multiple-family in the City? What is the vision for this area if it was redeveloped?

**Neighborhood Focus Items**

Neighborhoods are the foundation of Berkley. In the survey, many respondents listed their neighbors or neighborhood as the thing they liked best about Berkley. We anticipate having a chapter in the Master Plan dedicated solely to neighborhoods. We want to discuss with you the main issues we see in for these areas: Other Uses, Infill Housing, and Actions to Help Neighborhoods.

Why Neighborhoods instead of Single-Family Residential?

The Neighborhood Unit diagram to the right was created by Clarence Perry, in his 1929 Regional Plan of New York and Its Environs, which has influenced neighborhood planning in the United States to this day. The diagram shows how land uses other than houses provide the center of neighborhoods and contribute to the walkability of a neighborhood. We propose that existing
single-family areas in Berkley be planned as “neighborhoods” instead of rather than single-family residential to recognize that while houses are the main land use that other land uses and infrastructure (sidewalks, streets, broadband) contribute to the vibrancy and values of homes. However, we recognize that a broader title may cause concern. The Steering Committee agreed that “neighborhoods” was a better title. However, we would like confirmation from you on the following:

1. Should the FLU category for single family areas be “Single-Family Neighborhood”? 

Other Uses in Neighborhoods

While intent is to protect single-family homes, other land uses are allowed in these areas under the current Master Plan and zoning (see the table below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document &amp; Category</th>
<th>Uses other than Single Family Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007 Master Plan: Single Family Residential</td>
<td>Churches, parks, schools, home occupations and small-scale care facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Ordinance R-1A, R-1B, R-1C and R-1D districts</td>
<td>Publicly owned and operated libraries, parks, parkways and recreational facilities, municipal buildings and uses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In their discussion at their last meeting, the Steering Committee agreed that the single-family neighborhood future land use category should allow for duplexes, like those on Princeton, in a limited way and accessory dwelling units (ADU’s) should be explored. If you agree with those changes, your input, as the primary body responsible for land use decisions and recommendations, on how to best phrase limitations and considerations for duplexes and ADU’s are needed. We would appreciate your input on the following questions:

1. What non-residential uses should be planned for or allowed in single-family residential areas, outside of the uses listed in the table above and the future land use description?

2. Under what circumstances would ADU’s or duplexes be allowed?

Infill Single-Family Housing

In the survey and interviews, Berkley residents shared concerns about large houses being built that may contribute to stormwater runoff and hurt the character of neighborhoods. The 2007 Master Plan had a section on in-fill housing that recommended a number of standards for single-family homes including where attached garages could be located, where the front door should be located and a minimum amount of street-facing windows. It appears that many of these recommendations were never incorporated into zoning. We recommended and the Steering Committee agreed that the following Zoning Ordinance changes would limit the size of infill housing and lessen its impact on the character of neighborhoods:
• Decrease the maximum height to from 40 feet (R-1A) and 30 feet (other single-family zoning districts) to 25 feet, the norm in single-family zoning districts in many other communities.

• Regulate the roof pitch to lessen the impact of taller, infill homes.

• Consider a Floor to Area ratio requirement to limit the bulk of the infill homes.

• Consider a maximum impervious ratio to limit the stormwater runoff of the infill homes.

We would appreciate your input on the following questions:

1. Which of the zoning changes listed above should be pursued? Is their adoption realistic?

2. What other concerns do you have about infill housing?

Actions to Help Neighborhoods

Land use alone does not make a neighborhood. The quality of the homes and infrastructure influence the neighborhood as well. Berkley has recognized the need to plan beyond land use in single-family areas previously. In the current Master Plan, there is a chapter entitled “Neighborhood Reinforcement Recommendations”. It lists the following actions to encourage maintenance and rehabilitation of the single-family housing stock in Berkley: buffering between residential and non-residential uses, housing preservation and maintenance, streetscape enhancements. The 2007 Master Plan also included a section on enhancing bungalows.

We feel that some of these recommendations are still relevant, others are more appropriate elsewhere in the Master Plan, and a few are no longer appropriate based on changes in the real estate market. We shared the table below, summarizing the action and our recommendations, with the Steering Committee, who generally agreed with our recommendations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buffering between Residential and Non-Residential Uses</td>
<td>Appropriate transitional land uses including screening and landscaping to mitigate impacts of existing and planned non-residential uses on neighborhoods</td>
<td>Create a FLU category with design guidelines for buffering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include buffering in design guidelines for all corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codes &amp; Enforcement Practices</td>
<td>Codes and enforcement practices are updated. While this was an action item in the 2007 plan, we have not heard of maintenance as an issue.</td>
<td>Include in Neighborhoods Chapter a section on the continuation of defensible, enforceable codes and enforcement as a component of neighborhood maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>The 2007 Plan stated that well-kept street and sidewalks are important to neighborhood character. Infrastructure could also include water and sewer, green infrastructure, and broadband.</td>
<td>Include in Neighborhoods Chapter a section on infrastructure with specific actions for green infrastructure, sidewalks, streets, broadband, water and sewer. Add a recommendation for a sidewalk repair and maintenance program for neighborhoods. Add a recommendation for street tree maintenance and replacement in neighborhoods as a green infrastructure and beautification measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Up Services for Neighborhoods</td>
<td>These services would include trash service and yard waste and leaf pick up. The 2007 Plan recommended annual curbside removal of large-scale trash.</td>
<td>Include in Neighborhoods Chapter a section on the continuation and enhancement of City Services, such as trash pickup as well as other suggestions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Rehabilitation Programs</td>
<td>Assistance to homeowners to make housing repairs and continue basic maintenance was a recommendation in the 2007 Master Plan.</td>
<td>Do not include in new Master Plan unless there is a demonstrated need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Ownership Programs</td>
<td>Down payment or financing assistance for homebuyers was a recommendation in the 2007 Master Plan.</td>
<td>Do not include in new Master Plan unless there is a demonstrated need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Programs</td>
<td>Community awareness programs on blighting influences in neighborhoods, city services for and comprehensive code enforcement efforts in and adjacent to residential neighborhoods.</td>
<td>Change awareness programs to continuous city communication using a variety of platforms and include a section on what is important to communicate from the City to neighborhoods in the Neighborhoods Chapter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steps to Encourage Bungalow Rehabilitation</td>
<td>The 2007 Master Plan included zoning updates (front yard encroachment), financing for rehabilitation (program and tax abatements).</td>
<td>Include exploration of zoning changes for bungalow rehabilitation or expansion in Neighborhoods Chapter. Due to changes in the housing market and demographics, we do not think the need for financing is as urgent as previously.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We would appreciate your input on the following questions:

1. What are other neighborhood issues not identified above that should be addressed?
2. Which of the actions listed above should be in the Master Plan?
3. What other actions would you recommend be included?

Thank you for making the time for an additional workshop. We look forward to meeting with you on December 1st!

Yours Truly,

[Signatures]

Benjamin R. Carlisle, AICP, LEED AP
Principal

Megan Masson-Minock, AICP
Planner
### Revised Schedule: December 2020 – 2021

**Draft Date: 11/24/2021**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>December 2020 MPSC</strong></td>
<td>Plan Community Meeting. Review design guidelines &amp; corridor plans. Discuss Systems Focus Items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>January 2021 PC</strong></td>
<td>Discuss Systems Focus Items. Review design guidelines &amp; corridor plans. Share community meeting plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>January 2021 MPSC</strong></td>
<td>Review draft chapters on Future Land Use. Discuss Implementation Focus Items. Finalize community meeting plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>February 2021 PC</strong></td>
<td>Share draft chapters on Future Land Use. Discuss Implementation Focus Items. Prepare for community meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early February 2021</strong></td>
<td>Community Meeting on big picture changes and prioritization of implementation actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-February 2021</strong></td>
<td>Staff Draft Master Plan review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>February 2021 MPSC</strong></td>
<td>Review Draft Master Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>March 2021 PC</strong></td>
<td>Review Draft Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>April 2021 MPSC</strong></td>
<td>Final Draft review and thank you!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May 2021 PC</strong></td>
<td>Final Draft review. Recommendation to City Council for release to communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May/June 2021</strong></td>
<td>City Council – release to adjacent communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>June-August 2021</strong></td>
<td>Review by adjacent communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>August 2021</strong></td>
<td>PC Public Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>August/Sept. 2021</strong></td>
<td>PC Recommendation &amp; City Council Adoption</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Executive Summary

To be written at the end of the process
Background

In the winter of 2019, the City of Berkley began an update of the City’s Master Plan, last revised in 2007. Despite a global pandemic, the process endeavored to reach the Berkley community as broadly as possible to create a community-based vision and plan. This document is the result of over a year of intensive community engagement, data analysis and collaborative decision-making to create a vision for the City of Berkley with an actionable, realistic policy road map for implementation.

What is a Master Plan?

The Master Plan plays several roles:

**Vision:** The Master Plan lays out the future vision of Berkley, as well as a road map - with goals policies, strategies and actions - to achieve that vision.

**Aid in daily decision-making:** The Master Plan guides the Planning Commission, City Council, and other City bodies in their deliberations on zoning, subdivision, capital improvements and matters related to land use and development. It provides a stable, long-term basis for decision-making.

**Statutory Basis:** The Master Plan provides the statutory basis upon which zoning decisions are made. The Michigan Planning Enabling Act (P.A. 33 of 2008, as amended) requires that the zoning ordinance be based upon a plan designed to promote the public health, safety and general welfare. The Master Plan and accompanying maps do not replace other City Ordinances, specifically the Zoning Ordinance and Map.

**Public/Private Coordination:** The Master Plan attempts to coordinate public improvements and private developments supported by the Capital Improvements Plan. For example, public investments such as road or sewer and water improvements should be located in areas identified in the Plan as resulting in the greatest benefit to the City and its residents.

**Education Tool:** The Master Plan serves as an educational tool and gives citizens, property owners, developers and adjacent communities a clear indication of the City's direction for the future.
Location

Berkley is in a prime location in the southeastern Michigan region, located within a half hour driving distance of downtown Detroit as well as many other job centers and cultural amenities in the region. In a 2020 survey conducted as part of this process, almost 75% of respondents chose the city’s location in the region as one of the things they like best about Berkley.
City of Berkley Master Plan Process

PHASE 1
Vision & Outreach
- Plan to Plan
- Pop Up Exercises & Social Media
- Survey
- Data & Analysis
- Webinars & Walking Tours

PHASE 2
Plan Design & Drafting
- Draft Goals & Objectives
- Draft Future Land Use
- Steering Committee Meetings
- Plan Drafting

PHASE 3
Final Plan Adoption
- Virtual Community Meeting
- Adoption
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

The community engagement component of the Master Plan process was designed and started in 2019, before the start of the global COVID-19 pandemic. Working with the Master Plan Steering Committee, a group representative of the Berkley community appointed by the City Council, City staff and consultants adapted to the circumstances for the Berkley community to contribute to the Master Plan in a safe and meaningful manner. The Master Plan Process diagram on the previous page shows the community engagement events, some of which are described below.

Pop Up Exercises
In January through March of 2020, City staff and consultants went to various city and community meetings asking what people liked, would improve, would change or think is missing in Berkley. These activities were cut short by the pandemic and moved on-line as Zoom meetings with interested members of the public.

Community Survey
With the onset of the pandemic, additional resources were put towards the planned community survey in order to get broad participation. Over 1,300 people responded to the survey, including 1,280 Berkley residents.

Webinars & Walking Tours
A three-day workshop had been planned but was converted into a series of webinars and walking tours. The eight webinars covered the basics of master plans, hot topics in the community such as parking and housing, and draft vision, mission and values for the Master Plan. The webinars were posted on the City's YouTube channel for those who could not participate. Walking tours of 11 Mile, Greenfield, 12 Mile and Woodward happened in October 2020.

Steering Committee Meetings
Rather than holding an in-person multi-day workshop, the Plan Design and Drafting occurred during virtual Steering Committee and Planning Commission meetings in the fall and winter of 2020 and the early months of 2021.
Planning Timeline

2007
City of Berkley Master Plan

2012
Woodward Transit-Oriented Development Corridor Study for South Oakland County

2012
Multi Modal Transportation Plan

2017
Residential Future Land Use Master Plan Amendment

2019
Downtown Plan

2019
City of Berkley Energy Plan
This Master Plan has been built on previous planning efforts, bringing the most pertinent steps to the forefront in an understandable, achievable manner. Plans and amendments include those listed in the Planning Timeline.
HISTORY

Berkley today is a 21st Century community, with a design from the 1910’s and 1920’s, before the dominance of the car. The city’s history has created some of the city’s best assets and greatest challenges.

Early History

Prior to and into the early 1800’s, the area that would become Berkley was not settled by native peoples since it was mostly forest and swamp. There was an area known as Ottawa Indian Gardens (now Roseland Cemetery) that was sheltered and dry enough for native peoples to plant gardens of squash and corn which they would harvest in the fall as they returned from making a circuit through Canada or Ohio.

After the war of 1812, land grants were distributed to white settlers of this area, known as Royal Oak Township, which now is home to Berkley, Clawson, Ferndale, Hazel Park, Huntington Woods, Madison Heights, Oak Park, Pleasant Ridge, Royal Oak and Royal Oak Township. The forests were replaced with farms, mostly dairy farms, and by 1900 the area had a population of 468 people.

Founding of Berkley & Building Boom

The 1910s brought significant growth to the area with the completion of the Highland Park Ford Plant. Between 1910 and 1920, the last of Berkley’s farms were sold and turned into subdivisions, and the first phone line and electric lights were introduced. In 1923, Berkley officially became a village and with that came the first election, fire and police departments, and basic infrastructure. In 1927, the infrastructure of the village - sewers, water, sidewalks and streets - were built.

Great Depression & World War II

Growth in Berkley came to a grinding halt in 1929 with the stock market crash and the Great Depression that followed. 90% of the 5,558 residents in Berkley lost their jobs when the market crashed. The residents could no longer afford their taxes and as a result many services were canceled or reduced. The loss in tax revenue also forced shut off of the electric street lights. In 1932,
Berkley became a city so that taxes were lowered. Berkley continued to struggle up until the start of World War II which caused another surge of growth for the city.

**Post World War II**
In the 1940s, suburbanization and the post-war boom economy drove significant development in the area, as you can see by the photograph of 12 Mile in the center from the late 1940’s. The city reached a population peak of 23,375, in the 1960.

**1960's to Today**
From 1960 to 2010, Berkley's population steadily declined, with the biggest loss in the 1970's. Meanwhile, Berkley became part of regional infrastructure systems. From the beginning, the City's sewer system combined sanitary sewer waste water and rain water together and drained by gravity. In the 1970’s, the City joined Oakland County’s Twelve Towns combined relief sewer, which linked to a regional system. Up until 1995, the amount of rain in 10-year storms decreased but has been on an upward trend since. Houses and streets in Berkley and in the Twelve Towns system routinely experience flooding during storms.

Since 2010, the population has slightly increased. However, throughout its history, Berkley has been known as a good place to live. In 2017, Berkley was listed as the 28th best place to live for the money in the United States by Money Magazine.

**ASSETS & CHALLENGES OF BERKLEY'S HISTORY**
Berkley's history has lead to both assets and challenges for the City today. In terms of assets, the City's walkable design and range of single-family lot sizes make the City a great place to live. The City's grid road system, small blocks and tree lined streets lend themselves to walking, leading to high walk scores throughout the community. The variety of lot sizes, ranging from 40 feet to 100 feet in width, has allowed for a diversity of professions and incomes to live in Berkley.

However, the City's history presents a number of challenges. The size and shape of lots make construction of 21st Century buildings other than single-family challenging, the infrastructure is not easily updated to deal with climate change, and space is hard to find for parks and civic spaces.

The early 20th century design, has not allowed commercial areas to flourish in the same manner as the City’s neighborhoods. Commercial areas on 12 Mile and Coolidge Highway were originally platted as 20 foot wide and 100 foot deep lots. A modern building with parking and loading on site is more often 200 feet wide and over 300 feet deep. Redevelopment or even updating of existing buildings has been difficult without room for parking or building additions. However, over 50% of the survey respondents chose “more shopping options” as a change they would like to see in Berkley.

Different types of housing, ranging from townhouses to multiple-family buildings, are not easily built on these small lots either. The shallow lots leave little to no room for parking or yards for any housing on these corridors. Moreover, the single-family lots on 11 Mile and Greenfield are also too small to accommodate any residential type other than single-family. Lot assembly would likely have to occur for any new housing in Berkley, other than single-family.

Also, the combined, gravity-fed, regionally linked sewer system cannot be easily updated to improve its ability to function, adapt and absorb the stresses of climate change. The City has very little vacant land and no natural storm water outlets, such as a creek, river or lake and most of the soils have poor drainage.

Finally, the original plats for the City did not reserve space for parks, schools and other civic spaces. As the City has grown and needs have changed, space for parks, schools and City buildings has been difficult to find. However, almost half of the survey respondents selected “more recreational opportunities” as a change they would like to see in Berkley.
LAND USE

The map and pie chart on the following page show the location and percentage of types of land uses, based on a 2019 windshield survey, where consultants drove throughout Berkley to categorize land uses for each parcel. The data was then double checked with City assessing codes. When analyzed with building data from the Southeastern Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG) and historical land use data, the following land use issues are worth consideration:

Vacant Land is Scarce
Only 6.6 acres of the 1,655.6 acres of Berkley is vacant, leaving little room for new development. The largest vacant parcel is owned by the City of Berkley, adjacent to Merchants Park. Other vacant properties are along the corridors of Greenfield and 12 Mile or in neighborhoods just north of 11 Mile.

Single Family Houses Largest Land Use
The predominant land use, shown in yellow, is single-family residential, accounting for 936 acres or 73% of the City. The acreage of single-family has increased slightly by 56 acres since the last existing land use survey completed in 2001. According to SEMCOG building permit data, 379 single-family home building permits were issued in Berkley between 2000 and 2019, while 2,016 housing units were demolished. Based on the limited vacant land, it is unlikely that a significant number of new single-family homes will be constructed in the next decade.

However, the renovation and/or demolition and rebuilding of single-family homes will likely continue. The 2019 Community 360 Metrics Report, found in the appendix, estimates that 80% of the housing in the City of Berkley was built before 1960. In the community survey conducted in 2020, many of the respondents shared concerns about reconstruction of single-family houses where the new homes were out of context, in terms of style and size, with the existing neighborhoods.

Other Types of Housing are Limited
Multiple-family housing is clustered near Coolidge Highway, south of Catalpa, or on the edges of single-family neighborhoods. Multiple-family dwelling units, according to the 2019 Community 360 Metrics Report, are just over 12% of the existing housing. Moreover, housing units in buildings with less than 10 units, usually the size of multiple-family or attached single-family housing that best fit within or adjacent to a single-family neighborhood, is estimated to be only 4% of the overall dwelling units available.

Non-Residential Uses are on Corridors
Commercial, office and industrial uses, which collectively account for less than 6% of the City’s area, are along the corridors of 11 Mile, 12 Mile, Woodward, and Coolidge Highway. In the 2020 survey, respondents indicated preferences for commercial, entertainment, and mixed use, walkability, bikeability, and placemaking on these corridors.

Parking Lots are the Transition
Parking occupies 30 acres or just over 2% of the land use area in Berkley. These parking lots are often at the rear of properties fronting corridors or next to institutional uses, abutting single-family residential properties.

Parks, Schools & Institutions are in Neighborhoods and Corridors
The parks/recreation/open space and institutions (schools, churches, etc.) has increased in acreage from 46 acres to 74, now accounting for nearly 6% of the City’s area. Institutional uses tend to be on corridors or the edges of neighborhoods, while parks are either near schools or scattered within neighborhoods.

Cemetery is Sizable
Roseland Park Cemetery account for 10% of the land use area in Berkley. More importantly, it is privately held and occupies the northeast corner of the City, along the high traffic corridors of Woodward Avenue and Coolidge Highway.

Government is Light
Government land uses (city or county facilities) only occupy 4.1 acres or less than 1% of the land use area. These facilities are usually on corridors or adjacent to parks.
Existing Land Use Map and Percentages

Percentages are based on Geographic Information System (GIS) mapping data and do not include the acreages of streets or right of way.
DEMOGRAPHIC SHIFTS & TRENDS

The following demographic shifts trends impact the Master Plan:

**Population Stable but Aging**
The population of Berkley peaked in 1960 at 23,275 people, dropping significantly through the late 20th century and then stabilizing in the 2010’s, ranging between 14,000 and 15,000 residents. Berkley’s historic population trends are similar to other older communities nearby, such as Oak Park and Huntington Woods and to some extent Royal Oak. According to SEMCOG by 2045, Berkley’s population is anticipated to decrease by 1%, while the neighboring communities and the region grow slightly.

While the overall population number is predicted to decrease, the number of senior citizens is anticipated to rise. Residents 65 or older are forecasted to nearly double from 1,819 to 3,127 or 21% of the population. The need for senior housing, transportation, and services will increase. In the 2020 survey, over 61% of respondents identified planning for housing for seniors as very important or important.

**Population Becoming More Diverse, with Younger New Residents**
Though slightly more than 7% of the population are minorities, the racial and ethnic diversity of Berkley has increased since 2000, when the City was 98% white, and will continue to increase slightly. According to the 2019 Community 360 Metrics Report 5 Year estimates, all minorities and the Latino population are expected to increase slightly in the near future.

Per the same report, the majority of the new residents in the past three years were under the age of forty and lived in homes valued between $150,000 and $300,000. Also, 56% of the population 25 years or older holds an Associate’s degree or higher. Sixty percent of the new residents were single. Berkley can anticipate a more diverse and younger incoming population in the next 10 years.

**Single Family Houses Holding Their Value**
Data from Zillow in the 2019 Community 360 Metrics Report showed continued house appreciation, 39.3% over the last five years and 41.5% over the last decade. Between 2019 and 2024, the value of housing is anticipated to rise, especially for home valued between $300,000 to $500,000 or more. In 2019, the average home sale price was $221,700.

The preference shifts highlighted below will likely influence land use and future planning in Berkley:

**Increased Desire to Live in a Walkable Community**
Due a variety of reasons including health, transportation costs, and quality of life, people prefer to live in a walkable community. Berkley is a highly walkable community with a walk score of 77 out of 100. The grid road system and the ability to walk to daily needs from most neighborhoods contributes to the high score.

**More Interest to Live in “Green” Communities**
Greening of communities encompasses everything from multimodal transportation to more parks and open space, to carbon neutrality and renewable energy. Berkley has committed to these greening initiatives in planning documents and infrastructure investments while striving to implement green infrastructure on commercial and municipal properties.

**More Desire for Restaurants but Less for Chain Retail**
Prior to the pandemic starting in 2020, more people were eating out of the house more often, leading to an increased desire for restaurants, particularly fast casual. Also, in the late 2010’s, demand for new retail space by national and regional chains diminished substantially and with the economic downturn and increased shopping with home delivery due the pandemic, the demand for retail space and more service type uses will remain low. In the community survey conducted in 2020, most of the respondents wanted to see more retail and restaurant options along 11 Mile, 12 Mile and Coolidge.

**Decrease in Demand for Office Space**
Telecommuting and working from home were rising before the pandemic, dampening the demand for office space. Many employers are
expected to decrease their office space during and after the pandemic, if their work forces were effective working from home.

Berkley already had a significant amount of home-based businesses. In the 2019 Community 360 Metrics Report, business services at non-commercial sites, located mostly in neighborhoods as seen in the map on the opposite page, accounted for the largest group (30 entities) in a single SIC code.

**Increased Demand for Housing Other than Single-Family Homes**

As baby boomers are aging and Millennials are delaying home purchases, a single-family house respectively no longer fits the needs of newly minted senior citizens or are not affordable for often debt-carrying younger adults. Also, single-family houses, especially older homes, are not accessible for the disabled. Almost 62% of the respondents to the community survey in 2020 felt it was important or very important to plan housing for the disabled.

On a national and regional level, households are looking for options other than the single-family home. In the previous master plan and the 2017 Residential Future Land Use Master Plan amendment, the City of Berkley offered ways to address this need in a built-out community. In the community survey issued in 2020, respondents in open-ended questions were concerned about the size and height of apartment buildings.
Vision, Mission and Values

The vision, mission and values of this Master Plan are the guiding ideas for future land use and other related policy decisions for the City of Berkley. These statements were developed in conjunction with the Master Plan Steering Committee and the Planning Commission, with input from the public. They should be used by the Planning Commission, City Council, and other City bodies in their deliberations on zoning, subdivision, capital improvements and matters related to land use and development.

The vision is what the City of Berkley aspires to be in the future. It is the starting point for the policy road map that is the Master Plan. All goals, policies, strategies and actions should achieve this vision.

The mission is what City officials and staff do daily to achieve the vision. The mission should aid in daily decision-making.

The values are principles that guide decisions to stay on mission and achieve the vision for the City. While these aid in daily decision-making, elected and appointed bodies should use the values as touchstones during their deliberations.

Vision

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.
1) Berkley is caring

Berkley will make thoughtful 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.

2) Berkley is innovative

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.

3) Berkley is welcoming

Berkley will make decisions that welcome change, current and new residents, businesses, and visitors, such as maintaining a business-friendly atmosphere and hosting events that draw visitors from around the region.

4) Berkley is active

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Neighborhood</td>
<td>The Single Family Neighborhood category is intended to preserve the existing quality residential neighborhoods while recognizing the need for other uses that support these neighborhoods. Other residential types that blend with the existing neighborhood may be considered in a limited capacity.</td>
<td>Single family houses as well as parks, institutions, and utility buildings appropriate within neighborhoods. Duplexes may exist in neighborhoods, adjacent to corridors, or as less than 10 percent of a residential block. Accessory dwelling units may be allowed if the impacts, such as parking, can be managed on the property itself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Family</td>
<td>The Multiple Family category primarily includes multiple-family residential housing. This classification may have some limited mixed-use elements, such as non-residential uses geared towards day-to-day service needs of the resident population.</td>
<td>Multiple family dwellings and mixed use with a primarily residential component.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Corridor</td>
<td>The Residential Corridor category focuses on providing a mix of residential products including single-family, townhomes, and low intensity multiple family, and but also allows for office and other institutional/civic uses and spaces. Uses shall be compatible with the existing areas and respect adjacent neighborhoods.</td>
<td>Single family houses, attached housing, multiple-family buildings with up to 10 units, offices in adaptively re-used houses and institutional and civic uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>The Downtown category applies to Berkley’s historic Downtown core and is intended to create a vibrant city center with offices, entertainment, retail businesses, and restaurants serving the residences, daytime businesses, and nighttime entertainment populations.</td>
<td>Restaurants, retail, mixed use building with second story residential or office, office, public spaces, and institutions. No automobile oriented uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Corridors</td>
<td>Gateway Corridors are developed transportation arteries, with a mixture of residential, commercial, office and employment uses. The intent is to improve the function, investment value and aesthetics of corridor.</td>
<td>Restaurants, retails, mixed use buildings, office, multiple family, public spaces, institutions, and automobile oriented uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green/Transitional Buffer</td>
<td>The Green/Transitional Buffer shows where parking and a green buffer may expand to protect neighborhoods from patron parking on residential streets and other nuisances associated with adjacent corridors.</td>
<td>Green infrastructure, parking, landscaping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial/Retail</td>
<td>The industrial/retail category includes eclectic mix of uses. The focus is less on use but more on improving the function, investment value and aesthetics of corridor.</td>
<td>Light industrial, retail and restaurants with a market of nearby homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>The intent of this category to accommodate institutional land uses, including but not limited to recreation centers and schools, that contribute to surrounding residential neighborhoods.</td>
<td>Schools, civic or municipal buildings. If uses transition, single-family residential or cottage cluster residential developments could be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Cemetery</td>
<td>The Park and Cemetery category confirm established land uses that provide recreational and open spaces to the community.</td>
<td>Parks, athletic fields, cemetery, i.e. open space either owned by the City or the Cemetery.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>