



Introduction

The Master Plan represents a twelve-month effort by the public officials, Township staff, and the public. The document was prepared primarily in cooperation with the Planning Department, the Planning Commission, and Township Board. The process is described as follows:

- **Project Kick-Off.** At the beginning of the project, the Township held a project kick-off meeting to determine the planning process and begin to establish the areas of the Plan that should be updated. At this time the Township distributed a 'Notice of intent' in accordance with the Municipal Planning Act, as amended.
- **Existing Conditions Report.** An update to the description and analysis of the area's physical and social features was conducted. The current conditions of the City provide an understanding of the City's strengths and weaknesses and serve as a basis for future recommendations.

- **Public Involvement.** Once data collection was complete, a series of focus groups were held with residents and property owners, and the general public was invited to a workshop, both in mid-March 2007. The workshop included a brief presentation and display boards for participants to visit. The focus group and workshop combined allowed nearly 70 interested residents, business owners, and investors an opportunity to express their ideas either verbally and/or in writing. A more detailed description of the public involvement efforts and results are found later in this Chapter.

- **Vision and Policies.** A joint meeting was held on March 21, 2007 with the Township Board and the Planning Commission to review the results of the public's comments and to review the overall vision for the Township. The existing Master Plan's policies and recommendations were reviewed and modified as needed.

- **Analysis and Recommendations.** Based on the data collected from the existing conditions report, public involvement effort, and the experience of staff and consultants, information was then analyzed and recommendations were made for the future of the Township.

- **Agency Review.** Once the Township was satisfied with the draft plan, the Township Board passed a resolution to initiate the required agency review period in August 2007, in accordance with the Municipal Planning Act, as amended. This allowed a valuable opportunity for neighboring communities and applicable agencies to have an opportunity to submit their comments.

- **Adoption Process.** Upon completion of the agency review period, a public hearing was held to allow an additional opportunity for public comment at a Planning Commission meeting in November 2007. Following the hearing, both the Planning Commission and the Township Board adopted the Master Plan in January, 2008.

Summary of Public Comment

The following is a summary of the comments and suggestions that were offered during the different public involvement opportunities. Detailed results for each public involvement venue follow. Throughout the process there were many common ideas discussed and although not everyone that provided input agrees with the general comments listed below, they encompass the general sentiment of the opinions that were heard. In general, the following concerns were repeatedly brought up throughout out process:

- Maintain primarily residential nature of Township
- Keep current residential densities, do not increase
- Limit non-residential development to main corridors of Old-US 23 and Grand River
- Need for more active parkland
- Preservation of Township's natural features is a priority
- Desire to keep Township owned land as permanent open space
- Overall support for the development of pathways
- New development should be high-quality

Although public involvement is essential in the Master Planning process it is only one form of input used for the basis of this Plan. Public input, together with an examination of existing conditions, discussions with Township leaders, and professional planning expertise collectively serve as the basis for the Plan update's policies and recommendations.

Focus Groups

A series of seven focus group sessions were held throughout the morning and afternoon of March 14, 2007 at Township Hall to discuss planning and development issues that specifically affect individual geographic areas or neighborhoods within Brighton Township. Nearly thirty interested residents and property owners attended the focus groups and were involved in discussions pertaining to future land use patterns, natural features, transportation system, and community facilities and services. A list of questions was given to each participant; however, once

discussion commenced, the forum was left open for general comment. The intent of the focus groups was not to direct the discussion, rather it was to offer residents a forum to express ideas and suggestions in an informal way and help identify issues that otherwise may not have surfaced.

Geographic areas that were included in the focus groups included:

- Hyne/Old US-23
- Spencer/Old US -23
- McClements/Osborn/Clark Lake
- Pleasant Valley/Grand River/I-96
- Windswept Farms Area
- Newman/Van Amberg
- Hyne/Pleasant Valley

The following is a summary of the responses received during the focus groups.

Group #1 – Hyne/Old US-23

(4 attendees)

Comments:

- Changes in zoning without landowner notice
- Loss of agriculture
- Concern that Brighton Township will have more roundabouts like that at Lee Road
- Minimize amount of commercial, and where needed, include deceleration, bypass and turn lanes to keep roads safe, especially along US-23
- Need to plan for playground equipment at parks, particularly at old fire hall
- Rather than sell land for private development, the Township should develop them into neighborhood parks
- Need to follow-through on development conditions – hold them to their promises
- Safety of US-23 is a concern, need to study sight distances and identify where commercial driveways should not be located

- Water quality
- Provision of natural gas – many areas not yet served
- Don't encourage sewer line extensions. They are afraid that they will be extended for developments, and they will then be required to hook up
- Curve of Hyne Road, east of US-23 is a concern and the Road Commission needs to place reduced speed signs at curve
- Keep low density north of Hyne
- Don't encourage industrial on US-23, especially manufacturing and storage
- Don't develop a highway interchange at US-23 and Hyne Road
- Need activities for area youth
- Township should not sell land they own.
- Concern that taxes or neighbors will force them to move
- Last tree ordinance was too restrictive – it didn't even permit a landowner to remove even one tree!
- Moved here for natural setting
- Wildlife
- Low density residential (for this group means one unit per acre or less)

Group #2 – Spencer/Old US-23

(7 attendees)

Comments:

- Don't allow Spencer to I-96 go commercial (this was a somewhat split opinion among the group, some wanted mixed-use, but the more vocal ones wanted residential)
- The Township needs to make a final decision about the future of this area, commercial speculation in the area is preventing residents from maintaining their homes
- Township should start giving firm answers to developers, of course keeping in mind they can always apply, but where the Township knows they don't want commercial, tell them!
- Whatever the township decides, the road should be designed for that use; i.e. if it will be residential, then reduce speeds, and design the road as a residential street.
- Median could work across from Dominion entrance

- Integrate driveways, secondary access, service drives, cross- access for future businesses
- Visual and sound barriers needed between commercial and residential land uses
- Need to follow-through on development conditions – hold them to their promises
- Consider ways to upgrade buildings when re-use or re-occupancy occurs
- Consider the impacts of future road widenings and properly set back landscaping and signs in anticipation of future widenings
- Consider truck routes and highway access versus use of residential streets
- Site Plan Review should require additional conditions or special land use for 24 hour businesses, night traffic and deliveries, lighting, dumpster placement and service times, and enforcement to prevent loitering
- Coordinate with property owners when sidewalks are constructed
- One resident specifically mentioned financial/insurance site as a good example of redevelopment
- Residents like the residential feeling of Spencer to the west of the interchange.
- LSL should summarize the key changes from the 2002 plan as part of the public hearing notices and presentation.

Group #3 – McClements/Osborn/Clark Lake

(5 attendees)

Comments:

- Wetlands near Clark Lake should be protected because they directly contribute to Clark Lake
- Clark Lake has no spring or aquifer as its source – it exists from runoff from surrounding area, so it is impacted by any negative activity in its watershed
- Township-owned land should be donated for conservation before it is sold
 - “L” shaped parcel that is left after portion sold near Clark Lake has cut paths that people use – they could simply keep it public and let people use it that way

- Livingston Conservation & Sports Association (originally the Livingston Archers) owns large tract in the area and might be willing to expand – go to www.LCSA.info
- Coordinate with Genoa Township and other communities for regional park planning for residents living near township peripheries – this group felt more parks are needed nearby
- Coordinate with adjoining communities to ensure their regulations are compatible with ours, especially regarding lake regulations
- Concern about potential keyholing
- Clark Lake Road needs paving
- Monitor water quality to determine when, if ever, sewer and water should be extended to lake areas. Residents said they would only want sewer extended to them if their water quality starts to decline as a result of septic field failure

Group #4 – Pleasant Valley/Grand River/I-96

(2 attendees)

- The attendees included a developer and his partner who have interest in the southeast corner of Pleasant Valley and I-96
- Their site has 85' change in topography, contains a stream and several wetlands, very scenic
- Would prefer research & development/office designation for the site; industrial is not attractive to speculative buyers
- Site is more conducive to corporate headquarters, office or multiple family uses because these require less land balancing
- His experience with green construction is that it adds 20-30% to the total cost

Group#5 - Windswept Farms Area

(5 attendees)

Comments:

- Spencer Road, from Pleasant Valley to east Township line, needs paving, curb and gutter
- Spencer is at capacity, new development will result in need for paving
- Gravel pits need dust control regulations – contributions?

- Need youth recreation opportunities
- Police protection is inadequate in terms of patrol and response
- May need better police protection since State Police post will be moving – consider shared agreements like those for fire service
- Commercial areas should look urban, with curb and gutter streets and brick architecture
- Create well-defined commercial areas and make them urban in appearance, so there’s contrast between urban and residential
- No more strip malls
- Drainage along Old US-23, north of Grand River is poor
- Township should inform residents that clear vision zones should remain clear for road safety
- Township needs to communicate basic information via website, newsletters (i.e. burning restrictions, stewardship practices, etc.)
- Township should consider a general regulation regarding door-to-door activity, whether they knock on your door or just throw a free paper on the lawn – some feel it is littering
- Home occupations need to be held to a low intensity standard – some are proliferating beyond a residence and is not being enforced. Concerns for traffic, aesthetics and noise
- Support for pathways along Spencer and Township park, with a connection to Kensington
- Density – feels to cover costs for needed improvements like Spencer Road paving and future maintenance, residents recognized the possible need for more density in the area. Some liked the idea of being able to split their 5 acre lots, and liked the 1.5 acre lot size. Current density is preventing hi-speed internet and cable in the area.
- No objection to Windswept Farms development, as long as infrastructure can support it
- Fire protection is good

Group #6 - Newman/Van Amberg

(0 attendees)

Group #7 - Hyne/Pleasant Valley Neighborhood

(2 attendees)

Comments:

- Concerned for current ITC easement tree clearing activity in Hartland – Brighton needs to keep on top of that litigation to ensure Hartland will not just defer the impacts to Brighton Township.
- Learned that Wah Lake is currently dry – water has been draining since GM proving ground development
- Development concerns include impact on water table, traffic, noise, lighting
- These residents want to see Brighton stay as it is – mostly residential
- Traffic speeds on Hyne is too high
- Litter along roadways
- Protect water, wildlife, trees
- Supports traffic calming
- Supports pathways
- GM Proving Ground site may have arsenic contamination in Milford – someone in Brighton should start monitoring that to make sure it doesn't impact Brighton Township residents

Public Workshop

On the evening of March 14, 2007 Brighton Township hosted a public workshop at the Township Fire Hall on Old US-23. An invitation was posted on the Township webpage, local newspaper, cable channel, and throughout Township Hall. Nearly 40 people attended the meeting, the vast majority of which were residents.

The casual, drop-in workshop contained a brief presentation and a series of stations that the participants visited, including transportation, natural features, community facilities and services, and land use. Each station contained existing conditions information on the particular topic and participants were asked their comments regarding that topic on a survey.

The following is a tabulation of the survey responses received at the public workshop. Below each question is a list of responses, prioritized to show the most frequent answer at the top. General comments and write-in answers are listed below each question, and where comments were noted by multiple attendees, the frequency is stated in parentheses. Goal statements were reviewed by attendees, who were asked to rank their top

three goals and note those they felt needed to be removed. Each rank was given a value (a ranking of one equals three points, a ranking of two equals two points and a ranking of three equals one point), and the total value of all responses are indicated in the tables below. Comments offered by attendees, but not specifically requested in the survey, were noted in *italics*.

Station One: Welcome and Existing Conditions

1. What do you like best about living in Brighton Township right now?
(Check up to TWO)

17 Location

5 Neighborhoods

3 Schools

1 Community Facilities & Services

1 Proximity to City

Other (specify):

- (7) Rural quality
- (2) Natural areas
- Work here
- Lake Osborn
- Semi-Rural

2. What are the most important issues facing Brighton Township today?
(Check up to THREE)

16 Need protection of natural features

15 Better pathway system

11 Increased traffic

7 Pace of development (too fast)

3 Improve Public Services

2 Need higher quality development

2 Need more commercial business

0 Need more housing diversity

0 Pace of development (too slow)

Other (please specify)

- (2) Community parks
- Vying for money
- Require more green belts developer for must post a bond

3. Please list ONE thing you would most like to see improved in Brighton Township.

- (2) Clean up service for roads
- No commercialization!
- Preserved trees
- Police protection
- An educated populous regarding the importance of protecting natural features
- More involvement in management of and protection of lakes
- Stop clear cutting of trees
- Keep it the way it is
- We need a better pathway system. The roads see too busy and dangerous for kids & adults to ride

Station Two: Transportation

4. What should be the Township's top improvement priorities for transportation? (Check up to TWO)

- 12 Develop sidewalks & pathways
- 10 Reduce congestion on main roads
- 5 Improve subdivision road conditions/maintenance
- 4 Limit the number & spacing of driveways to improve circulation
- 4 Improve access to highways
- 1 Connect streets in residential developments
- Other (please specify)
 - (2) Hilton and Grand River
 - Pave roads
 - Improve access to highways at Hilton and US 23
 - Redesign Timmerface to dirt
 - Natural features
 - Don't Need!

5. Please rank your top THREE goals by placing the appropriate number in the "Rank" column of the table below. Place an "X" in the "Remove" column if you feel a goal should be removed:

<i>(26 people completed this portion of the survey)</i>	Rank	Remove
Provide non-motorized pathways that link residents to local landmarks	33	6
Require attractive parking areas that are of adequate size	3	5
Require traffic impact studies as part of development review	42	1
Direct development to locations with adequate road capacity	22	4
Encourage alternative modes of transportation including pedestrian, bicycle and ride sharing	12	4
Apply new concepts, technology such as access management to help preserve road capacities and improve safety <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Include roundabouts</i> 	19	1
Establish a consistent and attractive signage and landscaping theme at major gateways	7	3

Station Three: Natural Features

6. What should be the Township's top improvement priorities for the environment? (Please check up to TWO)

- 15 Wetland preservation
- 12 Woodland preservation
- 12 Limit density of development around lakes, rivers and wetlands
- 9 Protection of natural features along roadways
- 3 Access to & protection of waterfront
- 3 Wellhead protection
- 1 Flood prevention
- Other (please specify)
 - Swamp don't sell public land
 - Increase school bus usage by all!
 - Protection of high quality natural areas (need study done)

7. Please rank your top THREE goals by placing the appropriate number in the "Rank" column of the table below. Place an "X" in the "Remove" column if you feel a goal should be removed:

<i>(26 people completed this portion of the survey)</i>	Rank	Remove
Protect natural areas in connected corridors rather than protecting fragmented areas	32	2
Educate citizens on their role as land stewards	20	1
Locate intense or harmful land uses away from significant natural features	29	2
Develop flexible zoning regulations that encourage preservation, yet still retains landowner rights	22	2
Regulate development of steep slopes to prevent erosion	14	1
Maintain natural road corridors to help improve community character	32	

Station Four: Community Facilities

8. Are you satisfied with the quality of life in Brighton Township?

19 Yes 1 No 5 Undecided

Comments:

- Develop and support a watershed plan transportation, developments and all issues would be automatically included.
- Would like to see more parks and green space
- In last 5 years developers reigned- officials did little to keep it rural
- I'd like to keep it that way. It's a pleasant, peaceful and beautiful place to reside.
- Development is # 1 priority, public disconnected from local government activities.
- Room for improvement
- Where are the parks?
- Keep developers under control

9. What should be the Township's top improvement priorities for public services and facilities? (Please check up to TWO)

11 Provide more parks

9 Increase police and fire protection

9 Improve the condition of roads through paving and widening

5 Expand public sewer system

2 Expand public water system

Other (please specify)

- (2) Protect woodlands, wetlands, lakes, trees
- Pathways
- Develop commercial area for support
- Stop clear cutting

10. Please rank your top THREE goals by placing the appropriate number in the "Rank" column the table below. Place an "X" in the "Remove" column if you feel a goal should be removed:

<i>(26 people completed this portion of the survey)</i>	Rank	REMOVE
Provide park and library facilities that correspond to the needs of residents	19	6
Extend public water and sewer to logical areas where density justifies it and where impacts to natural features are minimized <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Clarify language- do not increase density</i> 	18	2
Provide on-going maintenance of pathways	11	5
Maintain quality fire protection and acceptable response times	37	2
Pursue regional watershed planning with neighboring communities, State, and County agencies	39	2
Communicate information of interest to Township residents through Township web page and newsletters	20	

Station Five: Future Land Use

11. What should be the Township's top improvement priorities related to community character? (Please check up to TWO)

- 11 Code enforcement
- 11 Create/preserve roadside greenways along roadways
- 10 Improve the sidewalks and pathway network
- 4 Improve design of new residential developments
- 4 Enhance Township entryways
- Other (please specify)
 - Make effort to retain rural character
 - Protect lakes
 - Trees/sewer
 - Improve cleaning up roads and areas
 - Enact sound environmental protection ordinances. Preserve township land as parks
 - Greenbelts
 - Greenbelts on lakes
 - Job generating commercial business

12. When developing new residential neighborhoods, what are the most important factors for the Township to consider? (Please check up to TWO)

22 Preservation of natural features/open space

12 Less density

5 Connection of streets

4 Inclusion of developed neighborhood parks

0 Variety of housing types

0 More density

Other (please specify)

- Depends on the area/impact and proposed
- Adhere to existing ordinance

13. When considering new commercial development, what are the most important factors for the Township to consider? (please check up to TWO)

12 Site location with respect to nearby residential

11 Building design and architecture

8 Site design (i.e. setbacks, parking, buffering)

7 Site location with respect to existing utilities

2 Driveway access and locations

Other (please specify)

- No more
- Size to compete with other areas/ New Hudson, Howell, Novi I drive to!
- Site in areas without impacting high quality natural features
- Location adheres to Master Plan
- Have enough

14. Do you think that there is the right amount of the following land uses in Brighton Township?

Land Use	Would like to see more	Have the right amount	Would like to see less
Single Family Residential	2	16	5
Multiple Family Residential	2	15	8
Manufactured Housing		10	14
Commercial/Office	4	11	8
Industrial	4	12	7
Institutional	2	14	5
Gravel Pits		7	17
Public Recreation	17	7	
Private Recreation	6	14	2
Right-of-way <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Increase setbacks</i> 	4	14	3
Water <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Include Wetlands</i> ▪ <i>Improve quality of creeks</i> 	10	11	1
Undeveloped <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Preserve as much as possible</i> 	10	11	2

15. Please review the Future Land Use Map from the existing Master Plan. Are there any uses that you feel should be located elsewhere? What other comments would you like the Planning Commission to consider when reviewing this map?

- Retain all rural residential areas- if possible increase. Get bigger box for the surveys.
- Sold nature preserve land at Hilton and Oak Knoll to private owner- destruction of nature preserve. Wildlife destruction.
- High tension wires should not be above ground - I do not want any going down Hyne Road.
- Spencer - all residential by Mobile.
- I would have liked to have had the township owned lands designates so we could have commented on what should be done

with them. I would like to see the elected officials be required to attend trainings offered in progressive land use techniques.

- All of the township land near Clark Lake should be designated park/open space.
- I would like to see SEMCOG population trends trapped against the existing Master Plan, then make adjustments to accommodate projections.
- More green area.
- Maintain the rural aspect of the township as much as possible during development.
- We are in uncertain times. It falls on the shoulders of community leaders and responsible citizens to move forward with a plan for the betterment of its citizens.

A letter was also submitted for the record at the public workshop, which emphasized the need to consider the interplay between water quality, recreation and aesthetics with lakeside land value. The author encourages the Township to, “recognize the unique needs of these Township lake communities and will enact meaningful, clear and enforceable statutes and more restrictive land uses specific to safeguarding and improving these Township treasures ... our lakes.” He hopes to accomplish this through adoption of general ordinances to regulate impacts to riparian vegetation and by appropriate land use planning so that development of land outside of lake watersheds is still considerate of the impact they may have on lake water quality. In addition, the author stresses the need for appropriate watershed planning in general, and regulations on non-residential activities, such as nurseries or gas stations, that may negatively contribute to lake water quality. He also hopes the Township considers the economic impact the lakes provide, but also respects the rights of individual land owners when evaluating public boat launches, keyhole development, and road construction projects.