CITY OF RICHMOND
MASTER PLAN

November 26, 2002
Revised: August 2008

Prepared with the Assistance of

McKenna
ASSOCIATES, INC.
COMMUNITY PLANNING ▪ URBAN DESIGN

235 East Main Street, Suite 105
Northville, Michigan 48167
(248) 596-0920

A C K N O W L E D G M E N T S

The City of Richmond wishes to express its deep gratitude to the following individuals, who played an important role in the development of this Community Master Plan. This gratitude also extends to members of the public and officials of our neighboring communities who participated in the visioning workshop and public hearings. Without such dedicated individuals, this important planning effort would not have been possible.

PLANNING COMMISSION

Dr. Patrick McClellan, Chairman
Douglas Pentzien, Vice Chairman
Geraldine St. John, Secretary
Mike Kaminski
Kathy Osebold
William Skelton
Richard Weinert
Honorable Tim Rix, Mayor- Ex-Officio
Jonathan P. Moore, City Manager- Ex-Officio

CITY COUNCIL

Honorable Timothy Rix, Mayor
James Schultz, Mayor Pro-Tempore
Mike Misteravich
Theresa Olson
Robert Reindel
Jeff Yaroch
Jeffrey Yelencich

CITY ADMINISTRATION
Jonathan P. Moore, ICMA-CM, City Manager
Karen M. Stagl, CMC, City Clerk
Troy S. Jeschke, Planning and Economic Development Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENT i

TABLE OF CONTENTS ii

INTRODUCTION 1

POPULATION AND HOUSING ANALYSIS 4

EXISTING LAND USE ANALYSIS 13

STRUCTURAL CONDITIONS ANALYSIS 20

HISTORIC STRUCTURES AND PRESERVATION 24

NATURAL FEATURES 29

SEWER AND WATER ANALYSIS 35

TAX REVENUE ANALYSIS FOR ECONOMIC BASE REPORT 42

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS 50

HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT 58

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES 62

BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT ANALYSIS 69

COMMUNITY FACILITIES ANALYSIS 76

MAIN STREET AND GRATIOT AVENUE CORRIDOR PLANS 81

FUTURE LAND USE PLAN 92

ZONING PLAN 102

IMPLEMENTATION 104

LIST OF MAPS

Map 1: Regional Location 2
Map 2: Existing Land Use 14
Map 3: Structural Quality 21
Map 4: Historic Structures and Districts 25
Map 5: Natural Features 30
Map 6: Soils 33
Map 7: Target Expansion Area 70
Map 8: Community Facilities 77
Map 9: Main Street and Gratiot Avenue Corridor Plans 82
Map 10: Future Land Use 93
Map 11: Zoning Map 103

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Population and Household Growth 5
Table 2: Historical and Projected Population 6
Table 3: Median Age 7
Table 4: Age of Population by Life Cycle 7
Table 5: Person per Household 8
Table 6: Household Types and Relationships 9
Table 7: Owner Occupied Property Values 10
Table 8: Household Income in 1989-1999 11
Table 9: Existing Land Use 15
Table 10: Future Service Area for Various Land Uses 36
Table 11: Tax Assessments by Land Use Classification 43
Table 12: Estimated Revenue Sharing Payments 45
Table 13: Income/Home Value Relationships 59
Table 14: Recreation Facilities Evaluation 80
Table 15: Existing Land Use on Main Street from Gratiot Avenue to Madison Street 85

INTRODUCTION

The City of Richmond occupies a total land area of approximately 2.7 square miles in the northeast corner of Macomb County. The City is located at the eastern boundary of the county, and extends into the adjacent to St. Clair County, approximately midway between the two county seats of Mt. Clemens and Port Huron.

Gratiot Avenue (M-3), Main Street (M-19), and 32 Mile Road, also known as Division Road, are the principal regional highways serving Richmond.

History

Richmond was founded by Erasmus Beebe in 1835. He traveled on foot with his two brothers and several men from an English settlement in New York from their eastern home to Cleveland, Ohio. In Cleveland, they acquired passage on the Robert Fulton Steamer to Detroit. On foot again, the pioneers made their way north to a settlement in Armada. Traveling along the Armada Ridge, they came upon an area where it intersected another ridge. Attracted by the beauty of the area and the richness of the soil, Beebe returned to Detroit to purchase the government land grants. Slowly the community grew and developed its own trades and businesses.

The Grand Trunk Railroad arrived in 1859, which accelerated the growth of the fledgling community. The railroad provided convenient access to the area's lumber and agricultural products, commodities that were in demand during the Civil War. In the following decades, industry flourished in the area. By 1878, the voters of Beebe's Corners and the two nearest neighboring communities, Ridgeway and Cooper Town, agreed to incorporate as one community. The following year, the Village of Richmond was established by an act of the Michigan Legislature. Richmond eventually was established as a home rule city in 1966.

The legacy of Richmond's rich history is seen today in the numerous historic structures that remain, the historic business district, and the street system established in the nineteenth century. Indeed, the historical character of the City is one of the greatest assets of the community.

Insert Map 1

The City of Richmond Master Plan provides a comprehensive view of the City as it exists today, with an eye toward what it can become in the future. In the analysis of current conditions, the following topics are considered in the Master Plan:

- Population and housing data
- Existing land use
- Physical condition of structures
- Housing needs assessment
- Historic structures and preservation
- Property tax revenue
- Public utilities, including sewer and water
- Natural resources and features
- Community facilities
- Transportation systems
- Economic conditions

Through a comprehensive analysis of the above issues, the Master Plan prescribes a vision for the future development and redevelopment of the City of Richmond. In particular, the following plans are presented:

- Community goals and objectives
- Future land use plan
- Main Street and Gratiot Avenue corridor plan

The Master Plan has been prepared in compliance with the Michigan Planning Enabling Act, Act 33 of 2008, as amended.

POPULATION AND HOUSING ANALYSIS

Regional Growth Trends

The City of Richmond, a long settled community, is poised on the outer edge of the growing metropolitan Detroit area. The greater percentage of Macomb County's share of this growth is occurring south of Richmond in the townships of Chesterfield, Macomb, and Shelby and the City of Sterling Heights. Each has experienced substantial new housing construction in recent years. These three communities have consistently been among the top ten growing communities in the seven county southeast Michigan region. Macomb Township led all communities in 2001 with 1,269 new housing units. Chesterfield Township was sixth with 499 new housing units, Sterling Heights seventh with 485 units, and Shelby Township tenth with 422 units during 2001. The total new housing units for all of Macomb County during 2001 was 4,403. It is significant to note that the above four communities accounted for 60.8 % of the total new housing in Macomb County during 2001.

Along with new housing has come population increases in communities throughout the region. The major exceptions to this are the older fully developed communities, due in large part to lack of developable land and the decrease in household size.

In Macomb County, Macomb Township, during the ten year period from 1990 to 2000, saw a population increase of 27,764 persons. The U.S. Census of 1990 reported a population of 22,714 and the 2000 Census reported a population of 50,478 persons for the Township. Adding nearly 30,000 persons is roughly equivalent to the population of East Pointe or Port Huron, each with approximately 32,000 persons.

Lenox Township directly south of Richmond also experienced a high percentage population increase during the 1990's decade. Population rose from 3,069 in 1990 to 5,362 persons by 2000, an increase of 74.7%. The City of Richmond's population increased by 18.2% during this same period, rising from 4,141 to 4,897.

A more meaningful measure of growth, however, is the number of additional households in a community. Over the last decade, from 1990 to 2000, the number of households increased in Macomb Township from 7,355 to 16,946 (130.4%), Washington Township from 3,826 to 6,155 (60.9%), Bruce Township from 1,324 to 2,114 (59.7%), Riley Township from 654 to 1,020 (56.0%), Chesterfield Township from 8,916 to 13,347 (49.7%), Lenox Township from 979 to 1,446 (47.7%), Shelby Township from 16,836 to 24,486 (45.4%), and the City of Richmond from 1,540 to 1,977 (28.3%). The significant increase in the number of households in Macomb, Washington, Bruce, Riley, Chesterfield, Lenox, and Shelby Townships accounted for almost 60% of all new households during the last decade in Macomb County.

The City of Richmond and several communities surrounding the City, including the Townships of Richmond, Lenox, Columbus and Casco and the Village of New Haven and City of Memphis. Collectively these communities had increases in the number of households from 1990 to 2000 (see Table 1) of 2,152 households.

A third area of Macomb County that has grown during the last decade is the four township area centered on Romeo. These are the Townships of Bruce, Washington, Armada and Ray and the Villages of Romeo and Armada. By far the greatest number new housing construction has occurred in Washington Township, where 2,596 new housing units were added from 1990 to 2000, a 259.9% increase. Bruce Township, immediately north of Washington added 720 housing units during the same period, a 294.7% increase from 1990.

Table 1
Population and Household Growth
City of Richmond and Selected Area Communities

	2000		2008 est.		Change 2000 to 2008	
Community	**Population**	**Households**	**Population**	**Households**	**Population**	**Households**
City of Richmond	4,897	1,977	5,916	2,412	1,020	436
Richmond Township	3,416	1,020	4,008	1,218	592	198
Lenox Township	5,362	1,446	6,017	1,762	655	316
Columbus Township	4,615	1,533	4,836	1,638	221	105
Casco Township	4,747	1,634	4,686	1,711	(62)	76
Village of New Haven	3,071	1,064	5,420	1,939	2,349	875
City of Memphis	1,129	457	1,084	477	(45)	20
Total City of Richmond and Surrounding Communities	27,237	9,131	31,967	11,157	4,730	2,026
Macomb County	788,149	309,203	835,948	344,375	47,799	35,172

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Census 2000 and SEMCOG for May 2008 estimates.

The conclusion reached from examining this data is that the lion's share of housing construction and population migration continues to move northerly within the Metropolitan Detroit area and was concentrated heavily during the past decade in the tier of townships which includes Shelby, Macomb and Chesterfield. Macomb Township especially has experienced unusually strong growth for both Macomb County and the seven-county Detroit region. The townships of Washington and Bruce on the M-53/Van Dyke corridor have also been growing at a greater rate than the several communities in the Richmond area of Macomb and St. Clair counties. Long range projections of population, housing, and employment by individual community continues this trend which is discussed later.

Population change for Macomb County and the City of Richmond since 1950 is shown in Table 2. During this period, Macomb County doubled in population during the 1950's, an increase of 220,843 persons. It grew by another 219,505 persons during the 1960's, but then tapered off with the general economic slowdown during the 1980's and in to the 1990's. However, the SEMCOG 2030 Regional Development Forecast indicates that the growth rate during the past ten years will continue reaching a projected population of 930,420 by the year 2030.

The City of Richmond′ s population has steadily increased since 1950. During the decades since, population has risen an average of 560 persons each decade, to the current population of 4,825. Projections made in the SEMCOG 2030 Regional Development Forecast indicate a population of 7,682 by the year 2030. This increase of over 2,700 persons is reflective of the City′ s location on the Gratiot/I-94 growth corridor, available public utilities, vacant land, public service delivery, and a positive image as a desirable community.

Table 2
Historical and Projected Population
City of Richmond and Macomb County

Richmond	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2035
Population	2,025	2,667	3,234	3,616	4,141	4,897	7,322
No. Change		642	567	382	525	756	2,425
% Change		31.7	21.3	11.8	14.5	18.2	49.5
Macomb County	**1950**	**1960**	**1970**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2035**
Population	184,961	405,804	625,309	694,600	717,400	788,149	925,723
No. Change		220,843	219,505	69,291	22,800	70,749	137,574
% Change		119.3	54.0	11.1	3.3	9.9	17.5

Source: SEMCOG 2035 Forecast

Age of Population

Age characteristics of population are an indication of public service demands and program needs. The median age of the City of Richmond residents increased during the 1990s from 32.2 in 1990 to 36.3 in 2000 (Table 3).

Table 3
Median Age
City of Richmond and Surrounding Communities, 1990- 2000

Community	1990	2000
City of Richmond	32.2	36.3
Richmond Township	32.7	37.3
Lenox Township	33.0	34.0
Columbus Township	31.9	34.2
Casco Township	29.2	34.7

Sources: U.S. Census of Population, 1990 and 2000

Age By Life Cycle

A more understandable age distribution of the City's population can be shown when age categories are combined into life cycle stages as shown in Table 4.

The age distribution data indicate that the number of mature families has been growing. Conversely, there has been a small decrease in family forming age group. The age distribution data indicates that while the elementary, secondary and post-secondary age group has declined slightly, the growth rate for the pre-school age group remains relatively flat. Table 4 also indicates the number of seniors is growing in population and will continue to grow as the mature family population reaches retirement age.

Table 4
Age of Population By Life Cycle
City of Richmond, 1990 and 2000

Age Group	Life Phase	1990	% of Total	2000	% of Total
Under 5 years	Pre-school	282	6.8%	307	6.3%
5 - 17 years	Elementary, Secondary	1,271	30.7%	1,318	26.9%
18 -34 years	Family Forming	1,341	32.4%	1,508	30.8%
35 - 64 years	Mature Families	677	16.3%	1,112	22.7%
65 + years	Retirement	570	13.8%	652	13.3%

Sources: U.S. Census of Population, 1990 and 2000

Gender Distribution

The 1990 population included 1,901 males and 2,240 females, about 45.9% and 54.1% respectively. The gender distribution of the City has remained relatively consistent during the last decade. According to the 2000 population included 2,348 males and 2,549 females, about 47.9% and 52.1% respectively.

Household Composition

The average household size has declined 36.4% since 1980, resulting in fewer persons per household (Table 5). This reflects a national trend of smaller families, more empty-nester, single-parent, senior, and single-person households.

Table 5
Person per Household
City of Richmond, 1980- 2030

	1980	1990	2000	2030
Household Population	3,556	4,004	4,850	7,607
No. of Households	1,232	1,540	1,977	3,409
Persons per Household	2.80	2.60	2.45	2.23

Source: SEMCOG 2030 Regional Development Forecast and U.S. Census of Population

Household Types and Relationships

According to the 1990 Census, the City of Richmond had 1,662 housing unit of which 1,540 were occupied and 122 were vacant. In 2000, housing units had increased to 2,062, of which 1,977 were occupied and 85 were vacant. Vacant housing decreased 30.3% during the 1990s and home ownership increased 36.5% for that same time period (Table 6).

Owner occupied households account for over 70% of the total number of households in the City of Richmond according to 2000 census data. The total number of households increased 28.0% over the past decade. However, over 65.6% of the total number of households in Richmond are households without children. Other factors describing household types and relationships are also shown in Table 6.

Table 6
Household Types and Relationships
City of Richmond, 1990- 2000

	1990	2000	% Change
Total Housing Units	**1,662**	**2,062**	**24.0**
Owner occupied	*1,037*	*1,416*	*36.5*
Renter occupied	*503*	*561*	*11.5*
Vacant	*122*	*85*	*(30.3)*
Family Households (families)	**1,052**	**1,332**	**21.0%**
Non-Family Households	**488**	**645**	**32.1%**
Total Households	**1,540**	**1,977**	**22.1%**

Source: U. S. Census 1990 and 2000.

Housing Characteristics

Housing in Richmond is predominately single family residential with 1,143 single family detached housing units, 219 single family attached and 71 two family-duplex units. Mobile homes account for slightly more than 5% of the housing stock in the community with 111 units and multiple-family (multi-unit apartments) account for approximately 25% of the housing stock.

Richmond's housing is very well maintained with few observable dilapidated structures. Nearly 50% of the current housing stock was constructed prior to 1960. Since age of housing is most often the first indicator of housing quality, continued maintenance and upgrading is encouraged.

The 2000 census reported a 93% increase in the median housing value in 1999 for the City of Richmond. At $135,300, the median housing value was within 2% of the median housing value for all of Macomb County. The increase is partly attributed to an overall increase in housing value in the region, but more importantly, the new housing units that have been constructed in the past decade are generally more expensive than the established housing stock.

Between 1990 and 2000, the most significant increase in owner occupied housing occurred in the $100,000 to $149,000 value range, and accounts for 48% of owner occupied housing in the City of Richmond (Table 7).

Table 7
Owner Occupied Property Values
City of Richmond

Value	1990 Owner Occupied Housing	Percent of Housing	2000 Owner Occupied Housing	Percent of Housing
Under $50,000	118	14.0%	30	2.6%
$50,000 to $99,999	625	74.1%	186	16.0%
$100,000 to $149,000	84	10.0%	556	48.0%
$150,000 to $199,999	14	1.7%	277	23.9%
$200,000 to $299,000	3	0.4%	110	9.5%
Over $300,000	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	844	100.0%	1159	100%

Source: U.S. Census of Population, 1990 and 2000.

The City has a varied mixture of housing with most being single family detached as stated. Over one-half of the housing units were five rooms or larger with two and three bedroom units predominate. Overall, Richmond's housing stock is varied offering a wide range of choices from mobile homes and studio apartments to large single family homes in newly built subdivisions.

Educational Attainment and Income

In the City of Richmond, of persons 25 years and over, 11.7% did not complete high school, compared to 20.2% in 1990. High school graduation rates increased by the year 2000 to 35.5%, compared to 28.2% in 1990. Of the 25.1% of the population who attended college, 9.4% received associate degrees, 7.3% received bachelors degree, and 6.4% have a Master's or professional degree. In Macomb County as a whole, 32.8% are high school graduates and 17.6% have received a bachelor's degree or higher.

The City of Richmond experienced an increase in annual household income from 1990 to 2000, especially for incomes brackets greater than $75,000. However, even as annual household incomes in that bracket increased, the median household income declined 6% by 2000. Median household income for the City of Richmond lags 20.1% behind the median income for Macomb County (Table 8).

Table 8
Household Income in 1989- 1999, as reported in 2000 Census
City of Richmond

Annual Household Income	1989 Households	1999 Households	% Change
Less than $10,000	212	100	- 52.8
$10,000 to $14, 999	122	128	4.7
$15,000 to $24,999	216	245	11.8
$25,000 to $34,999	233	297	21.5
$35,000 to $49,999	311	327	4.9
$50,000 to $74,999	368	445	17.3
$75,000 to $99,999	48	192	75.0
$100,000 to $149,999	29	220	86.8
$150,000 to $199,999	0	30	100.0
Median Household Income (in 1999 dollars), City of Richmond	**$46,150**	**$43,378**	**(6.0)**
Median Household Income (in 1999 dollars), Macomb County	**$52,172**	**$52,102**	**(0.13)**

Sources: Southeast Michigan Council of Governments

Employment by Occupation

According to the 2000 U.S. Census, 2,551 Richmond residents over the age of 16 comprise the labor force. Approximately 25% were employed in management, professional, or related occupations; 11.4% in service occupations; 24.3% in sales and office occupations; 12.5% in construction, extraction, and maintenance operations; 25.8% in production, transportation, and material moving occupations. The remaining 0.7% were employed in farming, fishing and forestry.

Among Richmond families, over one-half were two-income families and one in five had three workers with incomes. The automobile was the preferred means of transportation to work, with 85% of the work force driving alone, with a mean travel time of 32 minutes. Employment was largely within Macomb and Wayne Counties.

According to the 2000 U.S. Census, the total employment in the City of Richmond was 2,664. Employment grew 30.7% between 1990 and 2000. During that same time period, the services industry accounted for nearly 36% of all the new jobs opportunities. However, 41% of the total number of jobs in 2000 were in retail trade. Both industry sectors reflect the trend seen at the national level. SEMCOGs 2030 Regional Development Forecast projects the total number of jobs to increase 58.6 percent for the City of Richmond by 2030; adding 1,561 new jobs, primarily in the services and retail trade industries.

POPULATION AND HOUSING ANALYSIS

Key Findings:

- The population and number of households in the City of Richmond has been increasing.
- The greatest increase in population and housing units in the region is occurring in a tier of townships south of the City of Richmond comprised of Macomb, Shelby, and Chesterfield townships.
- Historical growth patterns in the metropolitan Detroit region show a ring of growth expanding from the central city.
- The City of Richmond is located at the outer edge of the growing metropolitan Detroit area.
- In the next two decades, the population and the number of households in the City of Richmond is projected to grow at a faster rate than in the past.
- The median age of the City′s population is increasing.
- The number of households has increased 60% since 1980.
- The average household size is decreasing.
- Mature families are making up a greater percentage of the City′s population.
- Young families are making up a smaller percentage of the City′s population.
- The number of housing units has increased 24.0% from 1990 to 2000.
- The value of owner-occupied housing has increased substantially in the past ten years.
- Nearly 50% of the housing stock in the City was built before 1960.
- High school graduation rates increased 35% over the past decade.
- Median household income decreased 6%.
- Employment grew 30.7% between 1990 and 2000.
- The City of Richmond is projected to add 4,225 new jobs by 2030, primarily in the services and retail trade industries.

EXISTING LAND USE ANALYSIS

Land Use Categories

Ten land use categories are represented on the Existing Land Use Map. The following table describes each land use as well as the amount of land, in acres and percentage of the total area of the City, each land use occupies within the City of Richmond.

Single Family Residential

The predominant land use in the City is single family residential use, comprising approximately 491.36 acres of land, or 29.18% of the total area of the City. Most of the single family residential dwellings exist on small lots, one-third acre or less, in compact neighborhoods. The few large lot single family dwellings in the City are located in the northeast sector. New single family residential neighborhoods are currently under development in all areas of the City, except for the fully developed central portion of the City.

Two-Family Residential

Most of the two-family residential dwellings are concentrated in a new development located at the north end of the City, west of Main Street (M-19) and south of 33 Mile Road. A 212 unit two-family development has is in the process of being completed. The remaining two-family residential dwellings are distributed throughout the City, interspersed in single family residential neighborhoods. Several of these two-family residential dwellings are converted single-family residential dwellings.

Multiple Family Residential

There are three concentrated areas of multiple family residential uses in the City. The first area includes a series of apartment buildings on the east side of Beebe Street and north of Division Road. The second area of concentration is the land east of Howard Street, north and south of Dow Street. The third area consists of senior housing on the west side of the City, including dwellings on Stoecker Lane and a facility on the north side of Division Road.

Insert Map 2

Mobile Homes

All of the dwellings comprising this land use category are located within a single mobile home park located to the east of Beebe Street and north of Division Road. This land use catagory accounts for less than 1% of the total area of the community.

Table 9
Existing Land Use Categories and Area

Land Use Category	Description	Acres	% of Total
Single Family Residential	Includes all single family detached dwellings.	491.36	29.2%
Two-Family Residential	Includes all two-family attached dwellings, including single family dwelling converted to two-family dwellings.	34.86	2.07%
Multiple Family Residential	Residential structures containing three or more dwelling units, including triplexes, apartments, attached condominiums, assisted living facilities, and nursing homes.	51.55	3.06%
Mobile Homes	Parks or courts specifically designed and developed for the exclusive use of mobile homes located thereon for temporary or permanent use as dwellings.	15.58	0.9%
Commercial	Improved land parcels used predominantly for wholesale and retail services, including financial institutions.	100.14	5.9%
Office	Improved land parcels used predominantly for private office services, including medical and dental offices.	8.78	0.5%
Industrial	Improved land parcels used predominantly for industry, including warehousing, light assembly and manufacturing, and granaries.	46.87	2.8%
Public/Semi-Public	Land parcels, either improved or unimproved, which are held in the public or private interest and exempt from real taxation, including public and private schools, churches, cemeteries, parks, and government buildings and uses.	168.05	10.0%
Agricultural	Land used predominantly or wholly as cultivated farmland pasture or woodlands with or without associated farm structures and residences.	169.22	10.0%
Vacant	Unimproved land with no current use.	574.56	34.12%
Water	Land containing surface water (i.e. Lake Angela West & East, Golden Pond).	22.84	1.4%
Total		1,683.81	100%

Source: McKenna Associates, 6/00

Commercial

There are essentially three commercial districts in the City of Richmond. Two of the commercial districts are located on Main Street, one near the intersection of Division Road and the other near the intersection of Beech Street. Both of these commercial areas are characterized by traditional form, that is, buildings located on the front property line with party walls in a pedestrian-oriented environment. Most of the commercial uses in these two districts are of the neighborhood convenience, specialty retail, and restaurant variety.

The third commercial district is located in Muttonville, near the Gratiot Road corridor. This area is characterized by automobile-oriented development, evidenced by large parking lots and drive-thru facilities. Most of the large scale commercial uses are located in this district.

Office

Office uses account for less than one half of one percent of the total land area in Richmond, and are distributed mainly along the Main Street corridor and also on Beebe Street, north of Water Street, and on Stoecker Lane, south of Division Road. All of the office uses are at a neighborhood scale, including insurance, medical and dental, real estate, and attorney′ s offices. There are no large office parks or districts in the City.

Industrial

The majority of industrial uses are located along Division Road, near the Grand Trunk Western Railroad. A few light industrial uses are clustered on Skinner Drive and Burke Drive, north of Division Road. A concrete plant is located on the other side of Division Road, north of the Grand Trunk Western Railroad. A few individual, isolated industrial uses are found in other areas of the City, including the granary at the corner of Main and Beech streets.

Public and Semi-Public

Public and semi-public uses account for 10 percent of the land area in the City. In terms of land area, the largest public and semi-public areas are as follows:

- The high school, middle school, and elementary school, which comprise the educational campus south of Division Road, west of Main Street.
- The area occupied by Beebe Street Memorial Park and Bailey Park.
- The U. S. Post Office and Michigan State Police facility on the north side of Division Road.

Other public and semi-public uses found in the City are municipal government facilities and parks, churches, private schools, and cemeteries. Public and semi-public uses are vital in forming a sense of community, because they tend to serve as important gathering places.

Agricultural

Land at the northwest section of the City is still used for agricultural purposes. Substantial agricultural land is also located on the south side of the City between 31 Mile Road and Main Street and at the southwest corner of Division and Gratiot Avenue. Agricultural use accounts for approximately 169.22 acres, or 10% of the total land area in the City.

Vacant

Approximately one quarter of the total land in the City is unused. Some of the vacant land is undeveloped but has been platted for future development. For example, there are four different residential developments that are under construction at the north end of the City that will consume much of the vacant land in this part of the City. Also, the vacant land around ALake Angela@ is platted for residential development. Excluding these planned areas, there is still a substantial amount of unused land in the City. Notably there are large undeveloped parcels east of Beebe Street Memorial Park, north of Division Road and west of Gratiot, east of Lake Angela Estates, at the southwest corner of the City, and on the south side of Division Road, east of Howard Street.

LAND USE ISSUES

Land Use Compatibility

There are no stark land use conflicts in the City. However, there are some areas for concern, which are as follows:

- Although the granary located on Main Street is an isolated industrial use surrounded by residential uses to the west and commercial uses to the south and east, the use itself is benign enough not to have a negative impact on adjacent uses. Indeed, the granary could be viewed as a historic landmark of sorts, evoking Richmond′s agricultural heritage. However, the accessory buildings on the north side of the site, because of their poor condition, detract from the overall quality of the neighborhood.

- The Department of Public Works building and yard is located in a residential district. Although it is not located in an ideal location, the DPW facility does not seem to have contributed to physical decline of the residential neighborhood. Most of the residences are in good condition, except for two houses near Division Road (see Map 3). The condition of these two houses is probably impacted by their proximity to Division Road more so than the DPW facility.

- Automobile dealerships and gas stations are categorized as commercial uses, but they have a disruptive impact when located in pedestrian-oriented commercial districts. Gas stations generate a large number of vehicle turning movements into a site, which increases the potential for vehicle-pedestrian conflicts. Bank and restaurant drive-thru facilities have the same effect. Automobile dealerships consume a large amount of land, thereby creating gaps in the streetwall of buildings that is crucial in forming an interesting pedestrian environment. These vehicle-oriented uses belong in a highway commercial district such as the Gratiot Avenue corridor.

- Intensive commercial uses, e.g., gas stations and fast-food restaurants, have the potential to negatively impact adjacent residential uses. Many of the potential conflicts can be addressed through good site development standards, such as screening, lighting, architecture, and access standards.

Integration of Land Uses

There are two distinct land use patterns that have developed over the years to form the current landscape of Richmond. The first of these patterns occurred before the second world war; it emphasized an integration of land uses among fairly compact blocks. Attention was paid to the accessibility of everyday uses−such as stores, work places, schools, churches, and parks−by foot. This pattern was established along Main Street from Madison Street to Mary Street, and extended to Beebe Street to the east, and Grove Street to the west. To this day, this area of the City remains walkable.

After the second world war, a new pattern developed, where land uses became more segregated. The growing popularity of the automobile as the primary means of transportation made it possible to develop large areas with only one land use. For example, the area of the City north of Madison Street is exclusively residential, except for a church or two. Obviously, there were perceived benefits to this development pattern, mainly in that land use conflicts were avoided. However, there are disadvantages to segregating uses. It leads to the reliance on the automobile. For example, there is only one park planned for the north end of the City. Therefore, children must rely on their parents to drive them to a park for outdoor recreation activities. Residents on the north side must drive to meet their everyday needs.

The segregation of uses also leads to the creation of uniform environments, where all housing units appear similar. For example, in the central, older section of the City, two-family residential dwellings are integrated within single family residential neighborhoods. In the newly developed area of the City, all of the duplex units are concentrated within a single development. Zoning regulations can also contribute to the segregation of uses and uniform environments.

Of the two land use patterns, Richmond draws much of its appeal from its pre-war development. The historic business districts and residential neighborhoods provide the City with assets that help define it as a unique community within the region. This traditional pattern of development, mixed uses and mixed densities, has made the City a desire destination to live, work , and visit. New development within the City should be planned to complement the established development pattern.

EXISTING LAND USE ANALYSIS

Key Findings:

- The predominant land use in the City is single family residential, which accounts for nearly one-third of the total land area in the City. Other residential categoriesBtwo-family, multiple family, and mobile homesBaccount for another 6.06% of the City′s total land area.

- The City contains a substantial amount of public and semi-public uses, which comprise approximately 168.05 acres or 10% of total land area. Key public and semi-public uses include schools, churches, parks, and government offices and facilities.

- Over 40% of land area in the City is either vacant or used for agriculture. This represents the potential for development within the current City limits.

- Office use accounts for less than one half of one percent of the area of the City.

- Less than 3% of the land area in the City consists of industrial uses. Redevelopment of existing industrial areas (i.e. Granary District) could increase property values and strenghten the tax base.

- The land use pattern around the periphery of the City is different from the central part of the City. Specifically, land uses tend to be more segregated around the periphery, resulting in a more automobile-oriented environment, whereas land uses are more integrated and compactly organized in the central area of the City, leading to a walkable environment.

- Existing mixed use development patterns should be preserved and encouraged.

STRUCTURAL QUALITY ANALYSIS

Introduction

In addition to land use, the physical condition of buildings and other structures must be assessed to determine the state of a community. The physical decline of structures is often an indication of an inappropriate location of a land use, such as an incompatible industrial use adjacent to residential use. It can also have a cumulative, or "snowball" effect, as a few deteriorating buildings can affect an entire neighborhood. Therefore, it is important to identify the substandard buildings in the City, and, more importantly, areas that may be subjected to any blighting influences. Such information will help determine actions that the City can take to counteract any negative trends.

Overall, the condition of the vast majority of buildings in the City of Richmond is sound. This is remarkable considering Richmond is a mature community with several old structures. The 2000 census indicated that nearly 50% percent of the City's housing units were constructed before 1960. Map 3 shows the location of buildings that are considered deteriorating or substandard.

Standard Quality Buildings

Most of the buildings surveyed are classified as of standard quality, which is a broad category including new buildings and older buildings that are well maintained. This category also includes buildings that appear structurally sound, but may require routine maintenance, such as cleaning, painting, replacement of windows or a roof. All buildings that are not categorized as *deteriorating* or *substandard* are considered standard.

Deteriorating Buildings

Buildings are categorized as deteriorating if they exhibit signs of substantial wear and tear that will require more than routine maintenance to repair. Signs of substantial wear include cracked and damaged exterior walls, sagging roofs and porches, rotting wood frames, or an accumulation of deficiencies. Basically, these buildings have the potential to be repaired and rehabilitated with a reasonable investment. However, in their present condition, they contribute to blight.

Four deteriorating residential buildings and one deteriorating commercial buildings have been identified. Two of the deteriorating buildings are located on the same block, north of Division Road, a red brick structure on Main Street and the other on Forest Avenue. The third deteriorating house is located on the east side of Main Street, south of Pierce Street. A fourth deteriorating house is located at the northwest corner of Stone and Division Roads.

The deteriorating commercial building is a former gas station, on the east side of Main Street, north of Beier Street. This site is planned to be redeveloped as a new gas station and is currently unoccupied.

Insert Map 3

Substandard Buildings

Substandard buildings are characterized by significant structural deficiencies that render them economically unfeasible to repair and rehabilitate. These buildings contribute to blight and are potentially dangerous.

It is not uncommon to find dilapidated farm structures in this region, with the decline of agricultural enterprises. However, the significance of substandard buildings is the negative image they promote along a main corridor of the City. The only structures that falls into this category is a cluster of substandard buildings is located to the rear of the granary on Beech Street.

Causes of Structural Decline

The structural decline of the buildings identified as deteriorating and substandard can be attributed to one of three reasons:

- In the case of the commercial buildings, they are all unoccupied and their maintenance appears to have been neglected for this reason.

- In the case of most of the residential structures, their inappropriate location, adjacent to nonresidential uses or on a major thoroughfare, has contributed to their decline. Often, when a single house or a small cluster of residences become isolated from other residential uses, the physical condition of the building tends to deteriorate.

- In the case of the substandard buildings, they no longer have a viable use at their location and have no potential for conversion to a different use.

Conclusion

An overwhelming number of buildings in the City of Richmond are structurally adequate. Moreover, most buildings are maintained in good to excellent condition. A few exceptions have been noted herein, but the relatively small number of such buildings do not suggest a trend toward blighted conditions, but rather are isolated incidents of structural deterioration caused by various reasons. There are no neighborhoods or areas that harbor a large number of deteriorating or substandard buildings. However, a few of these buildings are located on Main Street, which is the major image corridor for the City.

STRUCTURAL QUALITY ANALYSIS

Key Findings:

- Blight, as seen in deteriorating and substandard buildings, is not a significant problem in Richmond.
- There do not seem to be any overriding trends or common causes that account for the few buildings that are considered deteriorating or substandard.
- Deteriorating and substandard buildings, though few, exist within the Main Street (M-19) corridor, which is the main image corridor of Richmond.
- Promoting rehabilitation, redevelopment and adaptive reuse of substandard buildings, specifically within the Granary District, will have a positive impact on one's perception of the City and overall benefit to the community.

HISTORIC STRUCTURES AND PRESERVATION

Introduction

The numerous historic buildings that reflect the long and rich history of Richmond constitute a significant asset for the community. These historic structures contribute to the sense of place that is unique to Richmond, and, as such, create an authentic, Midwestern small-town atmosphere that distinguishes Richmond from other communities.

Although Richmond is not identified by a single pervasive architectural style, there are several buildings that are architecturally noteworthy. Many of these buildings are clustered together in concentrated areas. Architecturally significant buildings and districts have been inventoried, which are shown on Map 4.

There are two areas that have a large concentration of historic structures. The larger area is located on Main Street, north of Division Road, and also includes some houses fronting Forest Avenue. A second historic area is located around the intersection of Main Street and the Grand Trunk Western Railroad (referred to as the "Granary District"). Both these historic areas contain most of the vernacular, brick, commercial buildings that are characteristic of small Midwestern towns.

A common feature of several older houses in the City is the use of cobblestone and fieldstone for the building and porch foundations. This vernacular construction method is a loose unifying theme in Richmond's architectural heritage. Indeed, three of the City's most notable buildings–St. Augustine Church, parish center, and rectory–are constructed of fieldstones gathered locally by parishioners.

1. St. Augustine Church, located at the corner of Main Street and Howard Street, is a landmark building distinguished by its stone construction, Italian gothic elements, and twin steeples, which are among the tallest structures in Richmond. The church also serves an important design role as the visual and literal southern terminus of the Granary District. Two separate buildings on the site, the parish center and rectory complement the church in their design. St. Augustine Church is acknowledged in *Buildings of Michigan* (Kathryn Bishop Eckert, Oxford University Press, 1993).

2. Richmond Center for the Performing Arts (formerly First Congregational Church), located at 69619 Parker, the Fire Hall located on Main Street and Churchill, and the Huvaere Home located on Washington and Jefferson Streets are the only structures in the City currently listed on the National Register of Historic Places. They serve as architectural focal points for the neighborhood in which they are located as well as an as important community focal point.

Insert Map 4

3. The house located at 69725 Main Street is a splendid local example of Greek Revival architecture. There are other houses along Main Street, especially on the west side, that are notable in their architectural design.

4. Sanford Stone house and grounds, occupying a block bound by Beebe, Monroe, Stone, and Jefferson streets, is a historical landmark on the east side of the City. The site's context adjacent to the open space of Beebe Street Memorial Park and Bailey Park contributes to the prominence of the structure.

5. Bailey Park contains three historic structures—a schoolhouse, train depot, and log cabin—that were transported to the site. The buildings are currently maintained by the Historic Commission.

6. A cluster of three Queen Anne style houses are located on the west side of Forest Avenue, between Water Street and Division Road.

7. The house located at the southwest corner of Parker and Park streets is the best preserved example of Victorian era architecture in Richmond.

8. The Richmond Community Schools administration building located on the west side of Main Street, south of Division Road, is a singular example of Art Deco architecture in Richmond.

The above list is by no means an exhaustive list of structures of architectural or historic merit. The first step in developing a historic preservation program is to conduct a more complete, detailed inventory to identify historic structures.

While designation of structures on the National Register of Historic Places verifies historically significance, it does not ensure preservation of the structure. Provisions for assisting communities with historic preservation are provided at both through the State of Michigan and the Federal Government.

Methods for Historic Preservation

- Under PA 169, 1970, as amended in 1992, Local Historic District Act, the City may establish a local historic district. The initial step undertaken by the City is to establish a historic district study committee to begin the process of designating resources under a local ordinance. The study committee is a prerequisite to the formation of a Historic District Commission, which conducts a range of activities for the public purpose of historic preservation, including regulating exterior renovation or modification of historic resources, accepting state or federal grants and public gifts, and acquiring historic resources. From there, a historic district or districts is establishment, followed by the creation and adoption of a local historic district ordinance.

- The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 was amended in 1980 to provide for a federal-state-local preservation partnership. Grant funds were made available from the National Park Service through the State Historic Preservation Offices for Certified Local Governments (CLGs) to initiate and support historic preservation activities at the local level. If Richmond meets the eligibility criteria to become a Certified Local Government, the City can become eligible for grants available only to such communities.

- The Federal Historic Preservation Tax Incentives program have proven to be an effective tool for preserving historic resources and revitalizing the community. Two tax incentive programs are currently available, which foster private sector rehabilitation of historic buildings and promotes economic revitalization. The federal program is targeted at income-producing properties that are listed on the national register. The State program is available to both income-producing and personal residential properties that are listed on the national or State register or are in local historic districts. Both programs are administered by the State Historic Preservation Office.

- As an alternative to establishing historic districts pursuant to the Local Historic Districts Act, the City may create a historic overlay district in the zoning ordinance. Historic preservation and architectural design standards can be established to maintain the integrity of historic structures and districts in the City. In this case, the review authority would be the Planning Commission, a design review board, and/or City Council instead of a Historic District Commission.

HISTORIC STRUCTURES AND PRESERVATION

Key Findings:

- Historic buildings are a significant asset for the City of Richmond and provides a sense of place for the community.

- Most of the historic buildings are clustered within two districts.

  District 1: Main Street, north of Division Road, and Ridge Road

  District 2: Main Street, near the Grand Trunk Western Railroad

- There are several methods to preserve historic structures, including the formation of Historic District Commission and zoning overlay districts.

NATURAL FEATURES

Introduction

The natural environment of the City of Richmond and adjacent land offers both opportunities and limitations on the type and extent of future development. Two major natural features that pose restrictions on development include soils that are unsuitable for building foundations, poorly drained, and/or susceptible to flooding and wetlands that are regulated by the State. Natural features such as woodlands and wetlands are also valuable assets to community for the environmental benefits they provide, as well as their contribution to the quality of life of residents. Based on the analysis set forth herein, an environmental policy can be established with the goal of balancing the integrity of existing natural features and the future development of the City.

Topography

The topography of Richmond is relatively flat, gradually sloping down from a 750 foot elevation at the north end of the City to approximately 700 feet at the south end of the City according to the United States Geological Survey map. The gradual slope is interrupted by Armada Ridge, on which Ridge Road is located, a significant upland area that crosses the northwest quadrant of the City. There are no topographical constraints affecting future development in the City.

Woodlands

As a mature and developed community with a long history of agricultural and lumber enterprise, Richmond possesses few woodland areas. Small woodland areas exist, as shown on Map 5, at the northwest, southwest, and east end of the City. Woodlands provide wildlife habitat, soil erosion control, climactic controls such as wind breaks and shade, and natural buffer between land uses. Although none of the woodlands are currently used for recreational purposes, they have the potential to be a recreational resource.

All of the woodlands are located adjacent to developing residential areas. Preservation of woodlands next to and within residential developments could serve to enhance the appearance of the neighborhood.

Wetlands

Wetlands cover a wide spectrum of physical conditions and ecological characteristics making them difficult to define. Generally, wetlands have three characteristics:

1. Realitively shallow water on the surface all or part of the year;
2. Soils with a high organic content and which are different from upland soils; and
3. Vegetation adapted to wet soils, surface water, and/ or flooding.

Insert Map 5

While in the past, wetlands were considered to be useless land, it is now known that they have an important role in the hydrological and ecological systems. In addition to providing fish and wildlife habitat, wetlands also maintain and stabilize groundwater supplies, reduce dangers of flooding, control erosion, and improve water quality.

Currently, the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality regulates wetlands that are contiguous to lakes, streams, drains, and ponds, as well as those greater than five (5) acres in size. Land containing regulated wetlands has limited development potential because of the State's wetland protection measures.

Map 5 shows the wetlands identified by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the U. S. Department of Interior.

Water Resources

- *Surface Water*

  There are two major types of surface water found in Richmond. The first type are watercourses, specifically the Gillett Drain, which runs across the north end of the City, and the Fisher Drain, which runs along the western boundary of the City, south of Division Road. These watercourses are essential links in the surface drainage system in Richmond.

  The second type of surface water are man-made lakes that are remnants of past mining activity. These former gravel pits have been converted to become amenities within the Lake Angela development in the southeast quadrant of the City.

- *Groundwater*

  The City relies on groundwater for its water supply. As described in the Water System Master Plan Update (March 1999), six sequencing wells provide the water supply for residents. The multiple number of wells is the result of the relatively low yield of some of the individual wells.

  The water system is discussed in more detail in the Sewer and Water Analysis. However, protection of groundwater is an important natural resource issue as well as a utility issue. The Water System Master Plan identifies wellhead protection areas for this purpose.

Soils

In order to minimize construction costs and risks to the environment, it is desirable for future development to be constructed upon sites with suitable soils. Unsuitable soils present problems such as poor foundation stability, poor drainage, frost heave, and septic system failure. (The last concern is less relevant if a community waste water treatment system is available.) The primary source for soils information is the Soil Survey of Macomb County, Michigan (September 1971) issued by the Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

There are three soil associations found in the City. A soil association is a landscape that has a distinctive proportional pattern of soils. It normally consists of one or more major soils, for which it is named and at least one minor soil. The three soil associations found in Richmond are as follows:

1. *Conover-Parkhill-Lock association*

   This is the predominant soil association found in Richmond. It composes the land at the north of Ridge Road and west of Main Street, as well as most of the land east of Main Street. It is one of the best associations for agricultural use. Excessive wetness and slow runoff are characteristics of this soil association, which present severe limitations on residential and recreational use. These limitations cause difficulty in laying out streets and utility lines and in constructing houses. Highways constructed on this soil association are susceptible to breaking because of frost heaving and excessive wetness.

2. *Oakville-Boyer-Spinks association*

   This association is found along the ridge on which Ridge Road is located and also Main Street north of Ridge Road. It consists of well-drained soils that have severe limitations for agricultural use, but provides good foundation material for houses, streets, and highways.

3. *Wapesi-Au Gres association*

   This association is found mainly in the southwest quadrant of the City, south of Ridge Road, west of Main Street. It is characterized by somewhat poorly drained soils. The soils have moderate to severe limitations for use as residential sites. A seasonal high water table causes wet basements. Some areas are a good source of base material for trails, roads, and buildings. Also, effluent moves rapidly through the sandy material and can contaminate a water supply that is near the surface.

To present soil data in a way that is meaningful in the context of community planning, Map 3 identifies land containing soils that are poorly adaptable or unadaptable for development. Construction on unsuitable soils can result in shifting foundations, cracked walls, and cracked pavement and roadways. These problems often result in increased development and maintenance costs, and, in extreme cases, structural failure.

It is possible to develop on land with poorly adaptable soils, for example, by excavating and filling with soils suitable for building foundations. But the Soils Map provides a general picture of areas that may be problematic for development because of existing soils for the purpose of future land use planning. Of course, on-site studies and soils analysis are required to determine whether specific sites are suitable for development.

Insert Map 6

NATURAL FEATURES ANALYSIS

Key Findings:

- Soils that are unsuitable for building foundations, poorly drained, and/or susceptible to flooding and wetlands that are regulated by the State are two major natural features that pose restrictions on development in Richmond.

- Construction on unsuitable soils can result in shifting foundations, cracked walls, and cracked pavement and roadways. These problems often result in increased development and maintenance costs, and, in extreme cases, structural failure. It is possible to develop on land with poorly adaptable soils, for example, by excavating and filling with soils suitable for building foundations.

- Natural features such as woodlands and wetlands are also valuable assets to community for the environmental benefits they provide, as well as their contribution to the quality of life of residents. Preservation of woodlands next to and within residential developments could serve to enhance the appearance of the neighborhood.

SEWER AND WATER ANALYSIS

SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM

In March 1999, the City of Richmond prepared a *Sanitary Sewer System Master Plan Update* with the assistance of McNamee, Porter and Seeley, Inc. (now known as Tetra Tech). The Master Plan Update assesses the existing sanitary sewer system, as well as recommended improvements to the system based on anticipated growth in the City. The following section summarizes the findings of the *Sanitary Sewer System Master Plan Update*.

Description of Existing Infrastructure

The existing sanitary system consists of 143,691 linear feet (27.2 miles) of sewers ranging in size from 6 to 24 inches in diameter. Five pump stations are located at various points in the City to transport flow to the wastewater treatment plant (WWTP). The treatment plant is located northwest of 31 Mile Road and the Grand Trunk Railroad.

The Master Plan Update states that the existing system generally has adequate capacity, except for three submains that have peak flows near or above capacity. (Submains, also called interceptors or trunks, are the largest sewers, which carry flow from collectors to the treatment plant.) The analysis shows the Parker Submain and Stone Submain to be marginal, whish is defined as having projected peak flow at 90 to 110 percent of the sewer capacity.

The South Forest Submain is assessed in the report to be unsatisfactory, that is, projected peak flows exceed 110 percent of the sewer capacity. However, one needs to consider that the South Forest Submain is the main interceptor to the wastewater treatment plant. The projected peak flows for the South Forest Submain were determined on the assumption that all five tributary pump stations are in operation such that peak flows exist at all locations, which is an unlikely scenario. Past history indicates that the South Forest Submain capacity is adequate to serve current conditions.

As of 1999, the Richmond Wastewater Treatment Plant had as annual average daily dry wastewater flow of approximately 0.58 mgd, not including inflow and infiltration. The average daily flow increases in the spring by about 30 percent while decreasing in the winter by 25 percent.

The WWTP was designed for the year 2000 to serve a population of 6,860. The average daily flow with recycle is 0.90 mgd, while the maximum daily dry weather flow is 1.50 mgd, which are adequate to treat existing dry weather flows.

Projected Growth and Recommended Improvements

The estimated population of Richmond in the year 2000 is 4,825. However, the population is projected to increase substantially to 7,906 by the year 2020. While the existing sanitary sewer system may be adequate to serve the existing population, it will be necessary to improve and expand the system to serve a growing population. Anticipated commercial and industrial development will also require upgrades to the City's sanitary sewer system.

The *Sanitary Sewer System Master Plan Update* projects the build-out of the City, assuming the development of the following future land uses on currently unimproved land:

Table 10
Future Service Area for Various Land Uses

Land Use	Total Area
Low Density Residential	969 acres
High Density Residential	118 acres
Industrial	513 acres
Commercial	109 acres

Source: McNamee, Porter & Seeley, Inc., *Sanitary Sewer System Master Plan Update* (3/99)

Based on the assumption of the City's build-out with the above mix of uses, the Master Plan Update provides a number of recommended improvements to the sanitary sewer system. The improvements are divided into three phases.

Phase 1. The first phase should be planned for completion by 2003.

- K-Mart Pump Station. The K-Mart Pump, located at Main Street and Muttonville Lane, requires an upgrade to convey current flows, as well as future flows anticipated from the Lake Angela Estates service connections. An increase in capacity from 210 gpm (gallons per minute) to approximately 400 gpm is recommended for the sanitary pump station.

- Main Street Submain. In conjunction with the upgrade of the K-Mart Pump Station, an increase in conveyance capacity of some sanitary sewer along Main Street may be required. Depending on the results of flow monitoring, the 12-inch sewer from 420 feet northwest of the force main discharge to Howard and Main streets will require an increase in capacity, including increasing the sewer size to 15 inches.

- South Forest Submain. According to the Master Plan Update, the South Forest Submain is undersized from Skinner and Division to South Forest and Diane Lane. A 30-inch sanitary sewer is recommended to replace the existing 15- to 24-inch submain. This improvement will accommodate projected increased service areas and the potential increased capacity of the Division Road Pump Station.

- Division Road Pump Station. The Master Plan Update recommends the construction of a triplex pump at the Division Road Pump Station. This is based on projected increases in capacity from the current capacity of 2,000 gpm to approximately 1,100 gpm for Phase 1; 2,000 gpm for Phase 2; and 2,700 gpm for Phase 3.

- Eastern Pump Station. A new pump station with a 300 gpm firm capacity is required on the east side of the City, possibly near Division Road and Gratiot Avenue, to accommodate anticipated growth in this area. The Master Plan Update recommends a triplex pump station, including two 700 gpm pumps.

- Eastern Pump Station Force Main. In conjunction with the Eastern Pump Station, parallel 8-inch force mains from the new pump station to the gravity sewer at Division Road and Howard Street are required.

Phase 2 is planned for implementation between 2003 and 2009. Improvements to the wastewater treatment plant are included in this phase.

- Howard Submain. An 18-inch sanitary sewer is recommended to replace the existing 12-inch sewer that runs along Howard Street and Division Road to accommodate future growth on the east side of the City.

- South Forest Submain. A 30-inch sanitary sewer is recommended to replace the existing 21- to 24-inch submain from South Forest and Diane Lane to the WWTP on South Forest.

- Division Road Pump Station. The Master Plan Update calls for an increase in capacity from 1,350 gpm to approximately 2,000 gpm for the existing pump station at Division Road and Skinner Drive. A third 1,350 gpm pump is also recommended to increase the firm capacity to 2,700 gpm.

- Parker Submain. A 15-inch sanitary sewer is recommended to replace the existing 12-inch sewer from Division Road and Parker Street to Bartel and South Forest. Moreover, this sewer is likely to be located behind lots rather than down the streets, according to the Master Plan Update.

- Eastern Pump Station. During Phase 2, the Eastern Pump Station would require an increase in capacity from 700 gpm (as planned in Phase 1) to approximately 800 gpm. A third 700 gpm pump is recommended to increase the firm capacity to 1,400 gpm, which is the estimated capacity for Phase 3.

- Pound Road Pump Station. The Master Plan Update calls for a new pump station near Pound Road and the Grand Trunk Railroad to serve future development in the northeast section of the City. The Pound Road Pump Station is recommended to have a firm capacity of 430 gpm.

- Pound Road Force Main. In conjunction with the Pound Road Pump Station, 2,800 feet of 8-inch force main is required to connect the new pump station to the sanitary system.

- Wastewater Treatment Plant. The following improvements are recommended:

- Oxidation Ditch. Construct a third oxidation ditch with the same volume as the existing two ditches (680,000 gallons)

- Secondary Clarifier. Construct a new 50-foot diameter secondary clairifier.

- Sludge Storage Tank. Expand sludge storage with the addition of a 750,000 gallon tank.

- Activated Sludge Pump. Add one return activated sludge pump.

Phase 3 improvements are planned for 2009 and beyond.

- Lowe Plank Pump Station. A new pump station with an estimated firm capacity of 650 gpm would be required near Lowe Plank Road and 31 Mile Road to collect projected future flows west of the City.

- Lowe Plank Force Main. 4,400 feet of 8-inch force main will be required to connect the Lowe Plank Pump Station to the wastewater treatment plant.

WATER SYSTEM

In March 1999, the City of Richmond prepared a *Water System Master Plan Update* with the assistance of McNamee, Porter and Seeley, Inc. (now known as Tetra Tech). The *Water System Master Plan Update* assesses the existing water system, as well as recommended improvements to the system based on projected future demand. The following section summarizes the findings of the *Water System Master Plan Update*.

Description of Existing Infrastructure

The existing Richmond water system consists of six (6) production wells dispersed throughout the City, one elevated storage tank located in the northwest section of the City, and approximately 36.7 miles of water main. The size of the water mains range between one (1) to 12 inches in diameter. The elevated storage tank has a capacity of 400,000 gallons. Most of the transmission mains were built in the early to mid-1900's. Water mains typically have a service life of 70 to 80 years.

Existing Conditions

According to the *Water System Master Plan Update*, residual pressures (the pressure at a given location during a high flow condition, e.g., when a nearby hydrant is opened during a hydrant test) are adequate for peak hour demands and fire flow requirements are adequate at most locations. However, the service life of the existing water mains and the adequacy of supply wells are issues that must be addressed. Developing a schedule for water system pipe replacement is recommended.

Water supply is provided by six (6) wells. The relatively low yield of individual wells has required the City to continuously add wells. This condition is likely to persist. The Plan recommends conducting well water resource exploration on a continuing basis to identify alternate well locations before actual need.

The *Water System Master Plan Update* recommends improving available fire flows in the existing system by replacing water mains along Forest Street and installing a new main from Grove Street to Forest Avenue. Specifically, existing eight (8) inch mains should be replaced with twelve (12) inch water mains at these locations, as well as a transmission loop for future expansion.

Future Conditions

The *Water System Master Plan Update* projects the build-out of the City, assuming the development of the future land uses on currently unimproved land, as shown in Table 1 above.

Based on the assumption of the City′s build-out with the above mix of uses, the Master Plan Update provides a number of recommended improvements to the water system. In summary, projected growth in the City will require additional well supply and possibly elevated storage. The City may need more than one million gallons in additional storage for equalization and fire flow. Specifically, the following improvements are recommended:

Internal Improvements for Future Service

- Provide a 12-inch water main loop from 32 Mile Road, behind the high school to South Forest Avenue.
- Provide 16-inch water main along Main Street, from Pound Road, north to the Elevated Storage Tank.
- Provide 12-inch water main along Pound Road, from Main Street to the east City limit.
- Provide a 12-inch main along 31 Mile Road and Gratiot Avenue.

External Improvements for Future Service

- Provide an 8-inch main along the City′s east boundary from Pound Road south.
- Provide a 12-inch main along Pound Road east and south to 32 Mile Road extended main.
- Provide a 12-inch main along Gratiot Avenue 900 feet northeast of Main Street to 32 Mile Road extended main.
- Provide a 12-inch main along 33 Mile Road from Nature′s Way to Lowe Plank Road.
- Provide a 12-inch main along 32 Mile Road from west City boundary west to Lowe Plank Road.
- Provide a 12-inch main along Lowe Plank Road, from 33 Mile Road to 31 Mile Road.
- Provide a 12-inch main along 31 Mile Road, from Lowe Plank Road to Gratiot Avenue.
- Provide a 12-inch main along 32 Mile Road, from east City boundary to Gratiot Avenue.

Other recommended long-term improvements include replacing water mains along Main Street and Gleason Avenue, replacing all four-inch mains, and looping dead-end mains.

The City should consider a comprehensive groundwater management program, including the formulation and implementation of a wellhead protection program and a program to identify the limitation of ground water availability. The City should periodically assess alternative water sources to complement its municipal well system. Ultimately, connection to the Detroit public water system would be the preferred method of providing the City's water supply.

SEWER AND WATER ANALYSIS

Key Findings:

- The City completed *Sanitary Sewer System* and *Water System Master Plan Updates* in 1999. Each Master Plan has findings and recommendations based on current deficiencies and needs based on projected population growth. Recommended improvements are split into phasing within each of the reports.

- The Sanitary Sewer Master Plan Update states that the existing system generally has adequate capacity, except for three submains that have peak flows near or above capacity. The analysis shows the Parker Submain, Stone Submain and South Forest Submain to be marginal, which is defined as having projected peak flow at 90 to 110 percent of the sewer capacity.

- The service life of existing water mains and the adequacy of supply wells are water issues that should be addressed according to the Water System Master Plan update. Additional well sites and connection to the Detroit public water system should be considered in the long-term future of the City.

TAX REVENUE ANALYSIS FOR ECONOMIC BASE REPORT

Introduction

Analyzing the sources of tax revenue for the City of Richmond is important to stay financially healthy and in making future land use decisions. This section provides such an analysis by discussing the current state of the property tax base, the City's revenue and budget structure, and the difference in residential and nonresidential valuation. It also discusses current market considerations and the appropriate balance of uses based on the *Richmond Business District Master Plan*, *The City of Richmond Economic Development Strategic Plan*, and other studies and projections.

Property Tax Base Analysis

The City of Richmond's tax base has continued to increase from year to year. The City's taxable value increased by over $17 million to $148,121,940, representing a 13.1% increase for the 2002 fiscal year. According to the 2001-02 budget, the continued growth in taxable value has allowed the City to reduce the general debt millage and street debt millage and provide a tax reduction for property owners as it has done the last two years.

The tax assessments for the years 2000-2002, as provided by the City Assessor, are labeled in Table 13. Information is provided according to use for each of the eleven years (on the following page).

As can be seen by the figures, commercial and residential State Equalized Value (SEV) have continually increased. However, industrial SEV has varied, increasing some years and decreasing in others. The rate of increase for commercial also varies, increasing by only $122,934 from 1991 to 1992, while increasing by $3,266,784 from 1999 to 2000.

Calculations made using available data are also found within this table. The percentage of the total SEV for each land use in 1990 and 2000, the changes in SEV from 1990 to 2000 and 1999 to 2000, and the change in taxable value from 1995 to 2000 are all provided.

In 1990, non-residential uses (commercial and industrial) accounted for 27% and residential 64% of the total SEV for the city. By 2000, residential uses have increased to account for 73% of total SEV, while nonresidential uses account for 21% of the SEV.

However, commercial use SEV has increased at a greater rate than the other uses. Between 1990 and 2000, the SEV for commercial increased by 51%, compared to 33% for industrial and 34% for residential.

Table 11
Tax Assessments by Land Use Classification, in Dollars

Year	2002	2001	2000	1999	1998	1997	1996	1995	1994	1993	1992
Real:											
Commercial	28,943,279	24,943,806	25,772,219	22,505,435	21,182,213	20,580,612	18,781,209	18,271,529	17,329,534	15,343,082	13,602,361
Industrial	3,103,052	2,533,933	3,208,286	2,449,665	2,679,184	2,419,150	2,325,807	2,467,001	2,309,739	1,213,633	1,052,618
Residential	106,569,088	94,963,458	97,524,519	86,696,448	76,311,948	65,297,397	58,029,185	51,652,716	45,531,589	42,121,483	36,884,157
Personal:	9,506,521	8,467,825	7,418,317	6,958,251	7,148,030	6,566,745	8,090,595	5,236,101	4,747,929	5,339,416	4,681,005
Total SEV			133,923,341	118,609,799	107,321,375	94,863,904	87,226,796	77,627,347	69,918,791	64,017,614	56,220,141
Taxable Value	148,121,940	130,909,022	116,873,275	105,993,536	97,824,494	89,887,584	82,040,924	75,415,084	n/a	n/a	n/a

	Percentage of SEV: 2000	Percentage of SEV: 1990	Percentage Change of SEV: 1990-2000	Percentage Change of SEV: 1999-2000
Commercial	19%	25%	51%	13%
Industrial	2%	2%	33%	24%
Residential	73%	64%	34%	11%
Personal	6%	8%	59%	6%
Percentage Change of Taxable Value: 1995-2000	35%			

Source: City of Richmond, 10/02

The tax base created by the collection on taxable value provides 49.9% of the revenue for the 2000-01 General Fund. The remaining 50.1% is revenue from grants, permits and fees, etc.. The General Fund for expense is divided into many groups. Police, fire, and other emergency and safety divisions receive the largest amount from the budget at 35.6%. The administrative/legislation division receives 18.8%, followed by DPS/DPW which receives 12.1%.

One area of State funding that the City of Richmond receives is based on the State Revenue Sharing Act of 1971. This Act allows for the distribution of funds based on population. Table 14 provides actual payments and future projections developed by the Michigan Department of Treasury. As the figures demonstrate, the total amount of revenue sharing that Richmond will receive is projected to decrease through 2003. Projections beyond 2003 are not available but increases are unlikely due to weak economic conditions at the state and federal level at this time.

Table 12
Estimated Revenue Sharing Payments

	Total Revenue Sharing		Statutory Formula		Constitutional Per Capita	
	Payments	Percent Change	Payments	Percent Change	Payments	Percent Change
FY1998	548,883		297,040		251,843	
FY1999	548,883	0.00	289,664	(2.48)	259,218	2.93
FY2000	592,793	8.00	312,085	7.74	280,708	8.29
FY2001	632,064	6.62	314,287	0.71	317,777	13.21
FY2002	588,580	(6.88)	267,631	(14.85)	320,949	1.00
FY2003	579,490	(1.54)	243,661	(8.96)	385,829	20.2

Source: Michigan Department of Treasury, 2002

Relationship Between Residential Valuation and Nonresidential Development

Finding a good balance between commercial, industrial, and residential uses depends on a number of factors. The difference in tax revenue generated by and cost of services for each use must be considered to find an acceptable balance.

The amount of tax revenue that residential and nonresidential uses provide on average varies considerably. Table 13 shows that the SEV of residential uses is greater than that of nonresidential uses. However, this is because the number of residential units is much higher than that of commercial and industrial uses. On average, commercial and industrial uses contribute to a much higher amount to the SEV based on the same amount of land area.

Determining the cost differences to a municipality between residential and nonresidential uses also depends on a large number of factors. In general, the cost to the municipality of a specific use is commensurate to the cost of services for that use. Residential uses require a greater amount of funding than an industrial or commercial use. Residential uses require allocation to areas that are unnecessary for nonresidential uses, including recreation and library. Additionally, residential uses may require greater funding for services that are required by all uses (water and sanitary sewer systems, police, etc.).

Because nonresidential uses contribute to the City's tax revenue at a higher average rate and have lower service costs for governments, it would financially benefit the City to plan and provide for such uses. Other benefits of commercial and industrial development to the community include increased employment opportunity, spin-off economic effects on the local economy for each job created, and potential new residents. However, these benefits must be weighed against other effects of commercial and industrial such as additional traffic, including commercial truck traffic; demand on public services; and potential nuisances, such as lighting, noise, and odor on residential uses.

Market Consideration Analysis

The number of households will continue to increase according to SEMCOG projections. This corresponds with the projected rise in population of the City: 5,743 in 2010, 6,780 in 2020, and 7,682 by 2030. More significantly, the number of households in Richmond increased at a rate nearly double that of the population from 1990 to 2000. The number of households increased by 474 during the time period, an increase of 30.8 percent. The population increased by 668, which was an increase of 16.1 percent. The number of households is more relevant than population on determining the housing units needed, the demand on public services, traffic generation, and other planning considerations.

All things considered, the projected increase in the number of households will result in the need for housing construction and greater residential land use. Existing residential use zoning accounts for 590.28 acres of the City, or 38.53% of the total land area. However, many of the areas currently zoned for residential use are vacant (see Existing Land Use Map). The development of these vacant areas along with land currently used for agricultural purposes can accommodate much of the projected number of households anticipated in the next ten years.

On a regional level, residential uses will have the greatest effect on land usage in Southeast Michigan according to the Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG). Of the projected 251,000 acres that will be developed in the next 30 years, only 42,000 acres(16% of total land consumption) will be used for office, commercial, and industrial Buildings. Smaller households will account for 29% of consumption (74,000 acres), population growth 43% (108,000 acres), and the remaining 10% (27,000 acres) will be the replacement for losses of housing units in older communities. How relevant these projections will be for the City of Richmond remains to be seen. However, it may be useful to compare land use consumption in Richmond with the projected consumption for the region.

Currently, existing commercial/office land use accounts for 108.92 acres, or 6.5% of total land area in Richmond. Industrial use only accounts for 46.87 acres, or 2.8% of total land area. Thus, commercial and industrial uses account for only 9.25% of the total land area in the City. If percentage is maintained, it would fall below the projected land consumption of 16% for nonresidential development for the region. This data suggests that planning is needed to enable the provision of land for nonresidential uses to meet the projected need for nonresidential development in the region.

Commercial Market Trends

The development of retail and service uses will increase as the population of Richmond and surrounding township increase. According to the Urban Land Institute′ s *Shopping Center Development Handbook*, market demand for retail uses depends on two primary factors: increasing population and household income in the trade area. As the demographic data shows both population and household income are trending upwards in Richmond.

The *Richmond Business District Master Plan* in 1997 provides a good retail analysis that would be beneficial for future commercial considerations. According to the study, an additional 29,600 square feet is supportable in the study area of the plan. This study area consisted of the northern Main Street District (Historic Business District), the southern Main Street District (Granary District), and the Gratiot Corridor District (Muttonville). The study states that this addition of retail use represents $3,829,500 in projected new sales.

A void analysis was completed for the study area and is provided below. This analysis is designed to determine what additional retail and entertainment businesses the study area potentially could support. It is divided into categories and provides the supportable square footage.

The rationale for the recommended additional retail square footage as described in the Business District Master Plan includes: the growing population base, regional access, the opportunity for entrepreneurs and franchisers to locate in the study area, and the development of Richmond as a Atruly Midwestern historic city with authentic Main Street shopping and restaurants@ as a niche opportunity.

The *Economic Development Strategic Plan* was completed in 1995 and addresses four major issues: infrastructure, marketing and economic development, work force training, commercial development and growth. Many of the goals and objectives have been addressed to varying degrees of success. For example, development and annexation of lands for industrial use as described in Goal 2 of the Infrastructure section have not been completely successful as of yet. Annexation of 400 acres adjacent to the northeast boundaries of the City was turned down by the Michigan Boundary Commission, and the purchase and use of the 32 acre site adjacent to the current industrial park has been unsuccessful to this point. However, two properties in this area have been annexed by the City and present an opportunity to develop additional industrial uses.

Other goals have been more successfully addressed. Specifically, several objectives set forth in the Commercial Development and Growth section have been achieved, such as a more involved Chamber of Commerce, a streetscape improvement plan, and the development and implementation of the *Richmond Business District Master Plan*.

The Business Attitude Survey completed as part of the *Economic Development Strategic Plan* has many relevant comments and facts as well. Survey respondents noted growth and accessibility as positive and high taxes and lack of industry as negative traits existing in the City. The respondents, who represented a vast range of businesses, commented on better growth planning, the opportunity for expansion, and the need for more industrial tax base to lower the existing tax rate.

It is apparent from the SEV calculations that industrial growth is important and should be properly planned for. The existing industrial uses as described in the *Economic Development Strategic Plan* are primarily small manufacturing, concrete, and agro-related businesses. The Strategic Plan notes that the greatest potential for expanding and diversifying the area economy is to continue to attract small manufacturing businesses. It would also be beneficial to take advantage of the City′s proximity to urban areas, the international border and market, I-69 and I-94, as well as its rail accessibility to promote industrial development.

The market demand for industrial development is problematic to project. The availability of vacant land, public utilities and access to a State trunkline and a rail line make Richmond an attractive location for future industrial development. However, the success of industrial development in the City depends on regional factors, such as whether I-94 develops as an industrial corridor and whether Richmond is perceived to be conveniently accessible to I-94. Regional economic trends, which could illuminate local trends, are discussed below.

Identifying Appropriate Balance of Uses

As discussed previously, it is important for the financial well being of the City of Richmond to attract more nonresidential uses in the City. These uses would contribute to the tax base of the City at a greater rate than residential uses and would be less of a burden in terms of the costs of services for the government.

Residential uses have continually grown in the City and have provided more as a whole to the tax base than nonresidential uses. Residential uses are projected to continually grow, as are median incomes. Because of these factors, commercial uses and employment should grow as steadily. However, it is important for the City to encourage a higher rate of nonresidential growth than residential to meet the needs of the residential sector and to create more positive tax revenue for the City.

TAX REVENUE ANALYSIS FOR ECONOMIC BASE REPORT

Key Findings:

- The City's taxable value increased by over $17 million to $148,121,940, representing a 13.1% increase for the 2002 fiscal year.

- In 1990, non-residential uses (commercial and industrial) accounted for 27% and residential 64% of the total State Equalized Value for the city. By 2000, residential uses have increased to 73% while nonresidential uses provide only 21% of the SEV.

- However, commercial use SEV has increased at a greater rate than the other uses. Between 1990 and 2000, the SEV for commercial increased by 51%, compared to 33% for industrial and 34% for residential.

- The tax base created by the collection on taxable value provides 49.9% of the revenue for the 2000-01 General Fund. The remaining 50.1% is revenue from grants, permits and fees, etc.. This includes an estimated $592,781 allocated from state revenue sharing for 2000.

- The population of the City is projected to continue rising: from 4,141 in 1990, to 4,897 in 2000, 5,743 in 2010, 6,780 in 2020, and 7,322 by 2035.

- According to the *Richmond Business District Master Plan* completed in 1997, an additional 29,600 square feet of retail (representing $3,829,500 in projected new sales) is supportable in the study area of the plan by the year 2001. However, a growing population and an increasing median income level will continue to encourage and require additional commercial opportunities.

- New construction of the Kroger complex added 57,774 square feet of retail space and 16,000 square feet with the development of a Blockbuster Video along with other small retail stores.

- Richmond industrial uses, as described in the *Economic Development Strategic Plan,* are primarily small manufacturing, concrete, and agro-related businesses. The *Strategic Plan* notes that the greatest potential for expanding and diversifying the area economy is to continue to attract small manufacturing businesses and to take advantage of the City's proximity to urban areas, I-94 and I-69, and access to rail.

- Nonresidential uses continue to increase with a rising population; however, the allocation of such uses should go beyond this naturally occurring rate. Commercial and industrial uses will provide more on average to the SEV and will be less costly for the City to service than residential. Future financial stability should be based on this increase of nonresidential uses.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS

Review of Current Economic Development Plan

In 1994, the City of Richmond convened a group of local leaders for the purpose of drafting a strategic plan designed to guide Richmond′s economic growth and development. With the addition of the City Council and the City Manager, the leaders formed the Richmond Strategic Planning Committee. The Committee was assisted by professional staff from various public and private organizations serving the Richmond area. Under the sponsorship of the City′s Economic Development Corporation, an *Economic Development Strategic Plan* was completed in early 1995 reflecting the combined expertise and vision of the Committee, external professionals and the consultant retained to assist the community.

The Plan developed in 1995 identifies four critical issues and makes these issues the backbone of the Plan. These critical issues are infrastructure; marketing/economic development; work force training and commercial development and growth. Each issue includes goals along with a series of objectives and associated strategies and are included in the Plan by reference.

Summary of Status and Implications of 1995 *Economic Development Strategic Plan*

Although some elements of the 1995 Plan have not yet been implemented due to a variety of circumstances, the goals included in this Plan still serve as a concise statement of Richmond′s economic development visions and priorities. It is significant that notable progress has been made on the goals and objectives related to Commercial Development and Growth. This reflects Richmond′s present and future roll as a retail and service center.

Review of Current *Business District Master Plan*

The City, working in conjunction with its Economic Development Corporation and Tax Increment Financing Authority, prepared a Business District Master Plan in 1997. This Plan is in part an outgrowth of the 1995 Economic Development Strategic Plan. The Business District Master Plan includes a definition and analysis of Richmond′s trade area; an analysis of the existing retail mix along with recruitment and retention strategies; urban design recommendations, development guidelines and financing and implementation strategies.

This Plan generally concluded that Richmond′s retail district was in a strong position to benefit from anticipated residential growth and business development. At the time of this plan, it was estimated that an additional 29,600 sq. ft. of specialty retail and restaurant space was supportable in Richmond. While some of this space may have been absorbed by post 1997 development, population and economic growth will continue to drive demand for certain retail and service development. Historic theme renovation and the need for clear design guidance was highlighted. The implementation strategy called for assignment of roles for recruitment and retention activities; development of a marketing package; targeted acquisition and redevelopment; adoption

and promotion of design standards; relocation of incompatible industrial or high intensity commercial concerns; enhancement of awareness of available financing for business expansion; development of an historic theme; possible establishment of an Historic District; implementation of cooperative advertising; establishment of development guidelines; revision of the Zoning Ordinance and preparation of a Sign Ordinance and monitoring of grant opportunities.

Summary of Status and Implications of *Business District Master Plan*

Given Richmond's continued emergence as a strong regional retail and service center, the retail mix and implementation recommendations from this Plan continue to provide sound guidance. Issues of recruitment targets and future organization will be discussed later in this section.

Analysis of Current Trends

Any discussion of the influence of current economic trends on Richmond must begin with a review of the impact of the "New Economy." Authors Robert D. Atkinson and Randolph H. Court have described the salient features of this economy in **The New Economy Index: Understanding America's Economic Transition**. According to these authors, the following trends will have impact nationally and internationally:

- **More people will work in office and provide services.** The authors predict that 80 percent of the future workforce will consist of workers whose function is to process/ generate information or provide services to people.

- **The number of jobs at both ends of the spectrum will continue to grow.** Just as the number of high pay/high skill jobs will continue to grow, it is expected that low pay/low skill job growth will also occur. This trend will accelerate the movement to a two-class economy with high-wage, high-skill jobs at one pole, low- pay, low-skill jobs at the other pole and little in between.

- **Growth of global trade.** Whereas past trade patterns were characterized by industrial competition on a state or regional level, technological advances allow products and services to be sold from any location.

- **Knowledge producing firms are the backbone of the New Economy.** A large share of the economy is now involved in managing, processing and distributing information. Knowledge producing firms include telecommunications, banking, law, medicine, government, and education. The net stock of intangible capital (research and education, for example) is increasing at a faster rate than tangible capital (buildings, equipment and infrastructure).

- **The New Economy is constantly churning.** Total employment will continue to grow, but job creation and elimination will be more prevalent as it is predicted that nearly one-third of all jobs will be either added or subtracted each year.

- **E-Commerce will account for a large share of economic growth.** E-Commerce now encompasses business to business transactions, consumer retail and online financial services and is a central part of the New Economy. The internet economy, for example, is projected to

exceed $350 billion by the end of 2001. Between 1995 and 1998, the information technology industry contributed more than one third to the country's economic growth. Even with the burst of the "dot.com" bubble in 2001, of which the effects are still being felt throughout the economy, e-commerce has not been eliminated. As such, technology related economic development remains meritorious.

While these trends may seem remote, they will profoundly impact the future economic development of Richmond during the life of this master plan. These trends should influence the City's policies on future business development and the types of firms targeted for attraction.

Several local demographic trends have significance for the future direction of economic development in Richmond. These are highlighted as follows:

- **Population growth.** The City of Richmond's population is expected to grow by 56.9 percent by the year 2030.

- **Shift to higher income population.** Between 1989 and 1999, households in all income categories below $75,000 experienced moderate grow, 5.5%, while a 474.0% increase in households in categories above $75,000 resulted during this same period. The most pronounced increase occurred in two categories:

  - $100,000 to $149,99, which represented 1.9% if all household in 1989 and 11.1% in 1999; and

  - $150,000 to $199,999 category, which represented 0.0% of all households in 1989 and 1.5% in 1999.

  - In 1989, 5.0% of households in Richmond had incomes in excess of $75,000 annually. This category represented 22.3% of all households in 1999.

- **Increasing housing values.** Richmond's median housing value increased by 93% between 1990 and 2000.

- **Employment growth.** An increase in the number of employed Richmond residents of 58.6% is estimated by the year 2030. Much of this growth is predicted to occur in the retail and service sectors.

Challenges and Opportunities

These trends offer a number of opportunities and challenges. It is clear Richmond will continue to be regarded as a desirable place to live and numerous development opportunities will be created by increases in population and the higher income characteristics of the increasing population. Richmond will grow larger and more affluent and this change will create service and retail business growth. All the while this is occurring, Richmond must address the fiscal impact of residential growth versus industrial growth in the tax base. The attraction of manufacturing concerns will continue to be problematic as the economic shifts described above continue. Add to this the current shortage of available industrial land in Richmond and the likelihood of near term changes in the residential/industrial make-up of the tax base decreases. Although the outlook for retail and

service sector expansion is very positive, the inroads to be made by e-commerce should be a concern.

Existing Resources

The following resources are available to assist Richmond in its economic development efforts:

1. **Local.** Before discussing outside resources, it should be noted that the City has played an active role in economic development through its City Manager's office and by using such tools as the Tax Increment Financing Authority and Economic Development Corporation. The Chamber of Commerce also has assumed a proactive role in local economic development.

2. **County/Regional.** Macomb County has assisted in identifying existing industrial parks and in various other services to local government. Regionally, the Southeast Michigan Council of Government (SEMCOG) is a valuable source of data and technical support for local government economic development initiatives.

3. **State.** Much of the State of Michigan's economic development assistance and programming is currently focused on the Michigan Economic Development Corporation (MEDC). MEDC administers a number of programs including a significant portion of the State's Small Cities CDBG Program which is oriented to infrastructure projects which directly supports private sector job creation. MEDC has recently embarked on some significant initiatives such as LinkMichigan, SmartParks, and the Life Sciences Corridor programs. A separate agency- the Michigan Economic Growth Authority (MEGA) provides assistance with major business attractions and expansions.

   The Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) is a key source of infrastructure funding. Two programs administered by MDOT of particular note are the Transportation Economic Development Fund (TEDF) and TEA-21 initiatives. Both are competitive grant programs, with TEDF designed to leverage public and private investment by providing funding for road improvements which support private sector development and employment creation. TEA-21, which is in reality a Federal pass-through program, offers various types of transportation system enhancements such as streetscaping and landscape improvements.

   The Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) offers a number of programs aimed at environmental assessment and remediation with an economic impact. Its Site Reclamation Program has provided grant funds for the evaluation and remediation of contaminated sites where a private end user has committed to significant investment on the property once environmental closure has occurred. The MDEQ also offers grant funding of site assessment activities on sites where there is likelihood that the assessment will stimulate some development activities and administers a portion of the Clean Michigan Initiatives funding which allows the State to directly remediate contaminated sites without regard to economic development potential.

   Aside from the programmatic assistance, other State enabling statutes may be of use to the City in its future economic development activities:

The Intergovernmental Conditional Transfer of Property By Contract (PA 425 of 1984; a/k/a The Conditional Land Transfer Act) permits through a contractual procedure, the conditional transfer of property between local governmental units, which permits municipalities to share property tax revenues generated by a conditional land transfer for the purpose of economic development. The program is open to any city, village or township in Michigan and provides an viable opportunity for two local units of government to jointly benefit from an economic development project that might otherwise not be undertaken. In addition, PA 425 agreements are a preferable alternative to annexation proceedings, which typically are politically-charged and have a winner-take-all outcome.

The Development or Redevelopment of Principal Shopping Districts (P.A. 120 of 1961) allows for a broad range of activities to be undertaken within a defined Principal Shopping District including marketing, operation, maintenance and security. Activities are undertaken by an appointed board with the ability to special assess the cost of its operations pursuant to the Act after the approval of the local municipality′s governing body.

The Brownfield Redevelopment Financing Act. Originally enacted in 1996, Michigan′s brownfields redevelopment legislation provides many tools and incentives to promote the remediation and redevelopment of brownfields sites. Included is the ability to use tax increment financing as a funding source for certain environmental response activities on private property through a locally appointed Brownfield Redevelopment Authority. Additionally, Michigan Single Business Tax Credit may be obtained by the redeveloper of brownfield sites in an amount up to 25% of the qualified investment. The legislation was amended in 2000 with a general expansion of the benefits of brownfield investments.

Local Historic Districts Act (PA 169 of 1970). This act provides for the establishment of local historic districts and historic district commissions. After completion of inventories and legal designation by the historic district commission, the commission is then given the ability to control the exterior appearance of structures within the district through a permit and review system. In addition to fostering historic preservation by the regulation of exterior improvements, investor′s may now claim credit against their Michigan Single Business Tax liability for up to 25% of the cost of qualified expenditures for historic rehabilitation within historic districts established pursuant to Act 169.

In addition to the above resources, a number of Federal programs have potential applicability to economic development in Richmond. These include HUD′s Community Development Block Grant Program and Section 108 Loan Guarantee Program; Small Business Administration lending programs; Department of Agriculture Intermediary Relending Program; and Economic Development Administration Public Works Programs.

Identification of Existing Target Industries and Commercial Types

Inasmuch as no more recent market data has been gathered, the commercial mix and attraction recommendations included in the **Richmond Business District Master Plan** are still considered to be valid. Given the trend of higher income characteristics forecast for Richmond, there appears to be a strong potential to attract specialty retailers and service establishments to downtown Richmond. The list of suggested retailers in the 1997 Plan is a useful basis for a retail attraction campaign. Additionally, retailers in near-by markets such as Mt. Clemens, Port Huron, Oxford and Rochester Hills should be viewed as potential tenants if they are expansion candidates. This recruitment will need to occur within the context of available space in Richmond or on sites where redevelopment opportunities exist.

The attraction of businesses requiring industrial zoning is somewhat more difficult at this time. Two possible vacant tracts with appropriate industrial zoning exist at this time; however, one of the parcels is owned by parties unwilling to consider industrial use and the other parcel is the subject of litigation between the City and an adjoining township as to the legality of its recent annexation by the City. Both parcels are not technically in the inventory of available industrial parcels, so the City has no vacant industrial land to attract industrial users. It is reasonable to assume that this situation is not permanent and that the City will be in a position at some future date to attract industrial concerns to Richmond. The City should approach development of its industrial tax base in terms of encouraging investment by existing businesses where future land use considerations indicate this investment is appropriate. In the meantime, Richmond should be carefully monitoring the Macomb-St. Clair-Lapeer-North Oakland County region for individual start-up and growth companies who may be in a position to expand over the next five years. Since a significant portion of any community's economic growth is generated by firms located in or near the community, this strategy will facilitate communication with the most likely attraction candidates when Richmond has available land. In the process of identifying the area firms with expansion potential, Richmond should consider the characteristics of the New Economy discussed earlier. The Zoning Ordinance should be reviewed to determine that New Economy uses (research and information oriented businesses) are permitted in industrial or other districts.

Identification of Opportunities

Richmond's projected growth; high quality of life and income characteristics suggest a number of economic development opportunities and strategies. These are outlined below:

. **Continued Support and Enhancement of the Downtown**

Richmond has historically placed strong emphasis on the maintenance and improvement of its Downtown. The residential growth of Richmond dictates that these efforts be continued and, if possible, strengthened so that the Richmond economy can realize the full benefit of this growth. Specific strategies to consider include:

Organization: Many benefits have been realized by formation and participation of Richmond's Tax Increment Financing Authority. While it is important that this organization and its programming continue, the City, TIFA, property owners and business operators should address how the goals listed in the Business District Master Plan can be accomplished within

the current organizational framework. It may be worthwhile to organize a Downtown Management Board with the specific mission of promotion, marketing and maintenance.

Retention: Although not suffering a high vacancy rate overall, the Downtown is vulnerable to business loss. An organized retention program is the best response to this problem since it anticipates potential vacancies and can often recommend intervention strategies to avoid the loss of a business. The contact and communication inherent in organized retention visits also provide valuable problem solving opportunities and insights into how the Downtown can be improved. Finally, the problem of the underutilization of certain properties may be counteracted by proactively addressing the space needs of the Downtown businesses.

Attraction: Existing vacancies should be inventoried and a master list prepared containing all of the salient data on space available in Richmond. A systematic program of matching this space to potential users should then be undertaken.

Physical: The City and its TIFA must continue to plan and enhance the physical elements of the Downtown. Streetscape, parking and selective redevelopment should continue to be pursued as a part of a key strategy of physical development within the Downtown

. **Proactive Positioning for Industrial Development**

The current industrial land inventory is virtually non-existent, so some fairly aggressive measures must be undertaken to allow Richmond to grow its manufacturing tax base. These include:

Land Control/Assembly: One of the parcels potentially available for industrial development is owned by parties unwilling to consider this use. The City should consider voluntary acquisition from the current owners or some form of assignable option which would allow the City some time to actively search for a developer and a mechanism for the write-down of the purchase price to the end user. Once the property control issue is resolved, the City must still find a method of financing the cost of any infrastructure required for development. Possible solutions include the formation of a Local Development Finance Authority or grant assistance from the Michigan Economic Development Corporation..

Monitoring Existing Development/Redevelopment Opportunities. The City should carefully track existing industrial property owners and be alert to expansion or re-positioning opportunities. In the near term, these are the most likely candidates for increased investment.

Develop a Long Term Attraction Strategy and Target List: Richmond is located at the edge of an active business market rife with firms which will continue to expand over the next five years. In anticipation of the development of additional industrial land, Richmond should identify and nurture contacts with these firms since they represent the best prospects for development within Richmond.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS

Key Findings:

- An *Economic Development Strategic Plan* was created in 1995 by the Richmond Strategic Planning Committee. The Plan had specific goals and objectives developed by the Committee's professional staff and consultant.

- Four critical issues were identified in the Plan, including infrastructure, marketing/economic development, work force training and commercial development and growth. The City has undertaken many of the items related to these issues and should continue to do so in the future.

- The *Business District Master Plan* was completed in 1997 and includes an analysis of the existing retail mix, recruitment and retention strategies, urban design recommendations, development guidelines and financing and implementation strategies. In particular, the Plan concluded that additional retail could be supported by existing and future growth within the City. The recommendations and standards of the Plan should continue to be an objective for the City.

- Richmond's projected growth, high quality of life and income characteristics will continue to encourage various economic development opportunities and strategies. To utilize these opportunities, the City should be in a proactive position for commercial and industrial growth. This could occur by use of a Downtown Management Board, voluntary acquisition by the City for industrial land and similar programs.

HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Dwelling Unit Characteristics

Richmond's housing characteristics were discussed previously (see Population and Housing Analysis). It was indicated that the current housing stock is composed of 2,062 units, an increase of 400 units since 1990. Building permits issued since the taking of the U.S. census in 1990, were for 235 single family units and 278 multiple family units, which included all units other than single family detached. There were six demolitions during the past decade.

Single family detached now accounts for 1,180 units or approximately 54% of the total of all housing. This is a slight reduction since 1990 when they comprised 57.2% of all housing units. Construction of a fairly large number of housing units other than single family detached has caused this small decline. During the past 10 years, single family has accounted for 45.8% and multiple family 54.2% of all new housing starts. On a county-wide basis, the ratio is quite different, as 85% of all new construction in Macomb County since 1990 has been single family. The number of mobile homes in Richmond remained unchanged during this period.

The 2000 Census reported the median value of owner occupied housing was $135,300, rising significantly since 1990. A recent survey of homes for sale found 33 within the Richmond zip code area 48062, ranging from $60,000 to well over $300,000. Eleven were listed at between $60,000 and $150,000, ten from $160,000 to $195,000, and the balance of 12 from $210,000 and up. Four condominiums were listed, ranging in price from $92,000 to $118,000. Each of the latter had two bedrooms, 1,000 square feet or greater and was built ten or fewer years ago.

Generally, Richmond's housing prices are slightly below Macomb County's median. This is not necessarily negative as there is a need for affordable housing to the first time home buyer and others of modest means. Contributing to the lower median value may be the age of housing in Richmond, with approximately 50% of housing units being greater than 40 years of age. The City's location away from major employment centers may also be a factor.

Housing Unit Replacement

In the Structural Quality Analysis section of the Master Plan, four deteriorating residential buildings were identified. It will be assumed here that these buildings will in time be demolished as will one additional "sub-standard" house every other year to make way for off-street parking, new commercial developments or for other reasons. In the next decade, it is reasonable to expect eight to ten homes being demolished. This is not especially a high figure, and with new construction averaging 50 or more new homes per year, no substantial impact on the total housing stock is expected due to demolition. In fact, demolition of dilapidated housing can

only enhance the value of surrounding properties in the City. Observation of the City's housing, while conducting field surveys of existing land use and structural quality, concluded that overall housing is very well maintained with only spot clearance needed as noted above.

Housing Affordability

Housing affordability is a function of the market place meeting demand of persons and households seeking homes in locations of their choice. Richmond offers a broad range of housing types and prices. It continues to attract new residents, who may be bringing equity from former homes as down payments to Richmond for new home purchases. This has made existing homes affordable to the average new resident, as well as to the new home buyer. A second feature of affordability is the continuing reinvestment of homes by existing residents in upgrading and maintaining their homes. With rising incomes, homeowners can afford the new siding, window replacement, roofs and garages reflecting a recognition that Richmond is maintaining its value as a community and as a desirable place to live.

Table 13
Income/Home Value Relationship

1999 Income Category	Maximum Affordable Housing[a]	No. of Households in Income Category[d]	1999 Owner Occupied by Property Values[b, c]	1999
Less than $14,999	less than $37,500	228	22	(206)
$15,000 to 24,999	$37,500 to 62,499	225	105	(120)
$25,000 to 34,999	$62,500 to 87,499	203	260	57
$35,000 to 49,999	$87,500 to 124,999	327	373	46
$50,000 to 74,999	$125,000 to 187,499	445	247	(198)
$75,000 to 99,999	$187,5000 to 249,999	192	41	(151)
$100,000 plus	$250,000 or more	250	17	(233)

a. Affordable housing based upon 2.5 times income.
b. Estimate of number of owner occupied housing units in affordable housing range.
c. Owner occupied values supplied by NDS, 1999.
d. U.S. Census, 2000.

By examining the 1999 household income against 1999 existing home values, it is not surprising that the lower income households, those below $35,000, face a limited availability of affordable housing. Many of these households may be renters or householders without mortgages. The 2000 census reported that 26.0% of owner occupied housing was without a mortgage compared to 71.1% with a mortgage.

Utilizing a 30% factor of household income for lower income households shows that households with annual incomes below approximately $18,000 cannot afford market rate rental housing. Among those persons classified with incomes below the poverty level, about one-third are persons living alone. Among family

households, they are evenly split between married couple families and female headed households. Based upon the above, there are two housing trends that must be addressed. The first is that young families–first time home buyers–have little to chose from and must depend upon the availability of older lower priced homes. The second is the aging of the population and the diverse needs of the increasing number of seniors, particularly when the baby boomers born between 1946 and 1964 begin to mature.

The filter down theory of housing is that as residents move up the ladder, from a small home to a larger more expensive home, they create an opening for another family. The reality is sometimes otherwise, as young families struggle to find affordable and also decent housing. The expected increasing number of seniors are faced with a similar dilemma. Most wish to remain in the city where they have family and cultural ties. However, both the young family and senior may be forced to move elsewhere. The senior household may not be able to financially or physically maintain the larger home.

Affordable Housing Alternatives

National surveys show that home buyers are more willing to sacrifice lot size than the quality of the interior space. Housing incentives are geared toward reductions in lot size and exterior elements rather than design amenities. This can be provided through common open space areas, rather than individual yards.

Attaching units, clustering on buildable portions of the site, or increasing density are various methods of reducing the cost of housing. (Clustering reduces construction costs of pavement and utility extensions.) Also, scattered site attached housing as infill housing within existing neighborhoods could create affordable housing units within walking distance to daily amenities.

Analysis of Needs

The housing in Richmond forms the foundation for the community. The future of the City is dependent upon its ability to maintain and provide safe, desirable and affordable housing to meet the needs of existing and perspective residents. Most residents appear to be satisfied with the quality of housing in their neighborhood, however, recent trends in southeast Michigan have seen home prices rise much faster than the inflation rate, thus eliminating many potential homebuyers from the market. Providing affordable housing opportunities in a variety of price ranges and styles while preserving the quality of existing homes, promoting rehabilitation and new housing are challenges in maintaining Richmond as a vibrant community.

Achieving housing affordability for the low and very low income categories within the private market place is not realistic. Only through various financial incentives offered by programs through the Michigan State Housing Development Authority and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development can private developers deliver truly affordable housing for those most in need.

The purpose of the efforts of the Planning Commission is to develop a master plan that will provide guidance for its decision making in the years ahead. Most important in this context is to guide future development into neighborhoods that are viable, walkable and integrated into the community. Within the neighborhood, providing a balance of housing types dominated by the traditional single family detached, but also including multiple family, duplexes, attached single family, and senior housing, will contribute to the social well-being of the community by addressing the housing needs of all segments of the population.

HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT ANALYSIS

Key Findings:

- Single family detached housing units account for 1,143 units or approximately 55% of the total housing units in the City, which is a slight reduction from 56% in 1990.
- In 1999, the median housing value in Richmond was $135,300.
- Based on the median household income of approximately $44,000 in Richmond, the upper limit of an affordable house is $110,000.
- In general, there is a positive gap between household income and housing affordability, which typically means households have more disposable income.
- Data suggest that two demographic groups are underserved by the current housing market in Richmond: young families/first-time homebuyers and seniors.
- Providing mixed densities in the neighborhoods predominantly single family, but including multifamily, duplex, attached single family, and senior housing contributes to the social well-being of the community by serving all segments of the population.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

This section of the Master Plan states goals and objectives that the City of Richmond wishes to have. These priorities and issues are based on the previous comprehensive, utility, recreation and transportation master plans and citizen input received through the vision session and resident survey that the City performed. Through these tools of input, many ideas and concerns about the future of the City were expressed which have been formulated into the goals and objectives. Based on this, the Master Plan can be used by the various boards, commissions and committees in determining and assessing the impact of planning decisions.

The results of the vision session and survey indicate that residents greatly value the "small town atmosphere" and established community aspects of Richmond. The traits of this were consistently mentioned and are reflected in the different use categories that will be discussed.

Community Vision

The small town and historic qualities of the City of Richmond will remain if a pro-active approach to preserving these characteristics is undertaken. The City will continue to serve mainly as a residential community. However, commercial and industrial uses, which provide services and employment for residents, will continue to be encouraged in appropriate areas of the City. The City will consider PA 425, Intergovernmental Conditional Transfer of Property by Contract (Conditional Land Transfer Act), the Urban Cooperation Act and Annexation agreements to manage future growth.

By encouraging residential, commercial and industrial uses within existing and future areas of Richmond, the purchase of open space by the City and other tools, the City will be contributing toward the preservation of farmland and open space in outlying areas. Preservation of existing natural features will also be encouraged through setbacks, cluster development and similar programs.

Residential development should occur in an orderly fashion. New residential growth should first occur in vacant areas within the City that are planned for development and that can utilize existing infrastructure. Future growth should occur in adjoining vacant areas within the City and in areas proposed for City inclusion. The City should encourage cooperation with the Richmond School Board for involvement with new development proposals.

Commercial development should continue to be encouraged within the City. Creative and innovative commercial and office development should be encouraged throughout the City. Encourage use of existing structures in the historic downtown nodes. Commercial properties should utilize design standards which encourage consistent themes and limit negative traffic and land use impacts.

Industrial development should also be encouraged on appropriate sites within an identified industrial section of the City. This industrial expansion will provide the City with increased employment opportunities and a more diverse tax base.

Residential

Goal: Create, preserve and enhance well-planned, safe, traditional and balanced residential neighborhoods.

Objectives:

1. Promote the identification, preservation and redevelopment of historically significant houses and neighborhoods.

2. Promote new residential neighborhoods which reflect and complement the existing traditional neighborhoods. This includes promoting walk-ability, tree-lined streets, sidewalks, proper lighting, and parks and/or green space.

3. Promote neighborhoods which include a range of housing styles and types, by examining and encouraging development patterns and by creating financial incentives which promote variety and provide for all age groups including young families and senior citizens.

4. Encourage "green building" technology and "sustainable development" principles, which utilize vacant areas which have existing infrastructure, which promote efficient compromises for existing residential and downtown neighborhoods, and which preserve wetlands, woodlands and other significant natural features.

5. Encourage innovative ownership of housing units within the traditional downtown areas.

6. Examine methods of financing and programs which encourage maintenance or redevelopment of substandard residential units.

7. Continue to monitor conditions of residential homes and enforce housing codes.

8. Ensure that current and future residential areas are separated from incompatible land uses.

9. In providing housing types for all of the City′s residents, ensure that all housing types complement each other and are properly planned.

10. Cooperate with the Richmond School District for feedback on all new substantial residential developments and encourage school and open space mitigation.

Commercial

Goal: Provide an adequate variety of commercial facilities properly located to serve the residents of Richmond and outlying areas.

The City of Richmond *Economic Development Strategic Plan (EDSP)* and *Business District Plan (BDP)* each provide goals for the commercial aspect of the City. These objectives (and the source of each) are provided below with additional goals that arose from the previous Master Plan chapters.

Objectives:

1. Promote Richmond's commercial and retail sectors and develop new retailing opportunities to attract consumers and users of commercial services from throughout Macomb and St. Clair Counties. The Macomb Orchard Trail should be recognized as a vital component of an effective commercial development and redevelopment effort.

2. Promote compatibility in uses throughout the Richmond business district by relocating industrial and high intensity commercial uses to more appropriate locations and by recruiting specialty retail, office and services businesses into downtown.

3. "Create an active, vibrant, pedestrian-friendly environment in the Historic Richmond Business District and the Richmond Granary District" (*BDP*).

4. "Establish a common design theme for each commercial node with architecture, landscaping, lighting, signage, etc." (*BDP*).

5. Encourage linkage between the three commercial nodes but strengthen the individual characters and market niche of each node.

6. "Provide guidance to prospective developers, and to the Planning Commission who will review the site plans, by adopting a set of development regulations that incorporate the above-mentioned themes" (*BDP*). Proper compatibility between commercial and residential uses must be ensured with design and buffering tools (including walls, landscaping and similar).

7. Discourage strip commercial thoroughfare frontage developments and limit the negative effects that these developments may have. This includes limiting the number of site entrances, encouraging shared and marginal access driveways, and similar techniques.

8. Continue to require all proposed commercial rezoning to be justified in terms of neighborhood, community, and market area needs as applicable.

9. In providing commercial growth, utilize vacant areas which have existing infrastructure, which promote efficient compromises for existing residential and downtown neighborhoods, and which preserve wetlands, woodlands and other significant natural features.

10. Continue to monitor and enforce building and maintenance codes of commercial areas. Encourage

buildings, signage, landscaping and parking areas to be renovated or repaired on a timely basis.

Industrial

Goal: Provide attractive and well-located sites for industrial enterprises that will strengthen and diversify the tax base and provide a place of employment for residents of Richmond and outlying areas.

Objectives:

1. Encourage increased development of light industrial, research, and high technology uses, which promote a diverse economic base.

2. Establish design regulations for industrial uses and planned industrial parks that include green space, landscaping and improved building design and facades.

3. Promote strict enforcement of codes and regulations applicable to industrial areas, particularly for industries that create substantial sound and visual impacts.

4. Utilize vacant areas which have existing infrastructure, which promote efficient compromises for non-industrial uses, which are easily accessible to the existing transportation network and which preserve wetlands, woodlands and other significant natural features.

5. Utilize development of industrial land in industrial parks or planned industrial districts with well-designed sites and buildings.

6. Preserve and rehabilitate appropriate industrial areas by removing or repairing vacant and substandard buildings, removing incompatible uses and consolidating land.

7. Encourage the redevelopment of functionally obsolete industrial properties into viable commercial development where it makes sense to do so.

Farmland and Natural Resources

Goal: To protect, preserve, and enhance the unique and desirable natural amenities of Richmond and the surrounding areas.

Objectives:

1. Create a plan and/or program for the City to purchase open space.

2. Utilize the recommendations of the Boundary Adjustment Analysis and other sections of this Master Plan to encourage a set pattern of growth.

3. Cluster development to areas with existing or planned utilities/services, which preserve environmentally sensitive lands.

4. Develop setback and site plan design standards to protect natural resources and create open space through greenbelt landscape requirements and increased setbacks or buffers between conflicting uses.

5. Continue to protect wetlands and where possible restore altered wetland areas to their natural condition.

6. Provide incentives and encourage developers to preserve usable open space in new developments and install play areas, walkways and buffers.

Infrastructure

Goal: To provide and promote the transportation and public utility network necessary to support the current population and to provide future improvements in locations best suited for development to support managed growth.

Objectives:

1. Utilize the Water, Sanitary Sewer and Transportation Master Plans and the future land use plan to guide decisions making for public utility expansion and future road improvements.

2. Plan for infrastructure development with emphasis on access management, traffic flow and consistent and orderly development.

3. Accommodate increases in traffic volumes through maintenance, intersection improvements and similar techniques.

4. Enact efficient and workable compromises between infrastructure and land uses through careful planning and scrutiny of development proposals. One such priority is providing a compromise between the traffic of Main Street and the businesses and uses of the downtown areas.

5. Ensure proper maintenance and expansion of pedestrian safety paths and crosswalks to link current and future residential areas with schools, recreation areas, commercial districts, and other attractions.

Public Facilities

Goal: To provide necessary governmental, emergency, cultural and recreation facilities for the City.

Objectives:

1. Consult the City′ s *Parks and Recreation Master Plan* to guide recreation decisions and review and update regularly.

2. Provide year-long recreation opportunities for all residents, without regard to age, race, religion,

physical or mental well-being, gender or economic circumstances.

3. Encourage continued cooperation with the Richmond Community School District in sharing facilities for community recreation programs.

4. Consider the availability and access to public, private and commercial recreation opportunities available in nearby communities in evaluating future recreation needs, encourage cooperation in usage and construction of these facilities and avoid duplication.

5. Utilize the area′s existing natural features for open space and recreation purposes.

6. Encourage the development of community-wide and neighborhood parks and well-designed and operated commercial recreation facilities offering a full array of both active and passive recreation facilities to be focal points for recreation activities.

7. Promote and encourage adequate recreation and open space as an integral part of each development including single family subdivisions, multiple family developments and mobile home parks through appropriate planning and zoning tools.

8. Encourage the development of a pedestrian/bicycle path system, linking residential neighborhoods to recreational facilities throughout the area.

9. Design future recreation facilities to minimize maintenance expenses.

10. Monitor and adjust program offerings to reflect changing recreation preferences.

11. Provide a consistent level of funding, staffing and promotion to support improvements to the area′s recreation facilities and programs and continued maintenance of these parks (*RMP*).

12. Encourage new developments to preserve and/or mitigate areas for city and school facilities.

13. Continue to provide adequate facilities for the municipal needs of the City by utilizing expanding structures and expanding or renovating when necessary.

14. Promote identification and preservation of buildings and sites that have historic or cultural significance.

Economics

Goal: Promote development of a financially secure community that can continue to provide all necessary municipal, educational, medical, and recreational services to its residents and businesses in an efficient manner.

Objectives:

1. Encourage development which provides a diversified tax base and lessens the tax burden on residential property owners.

2. Encourage the development of comprehensive medical treatment, testing and research facilities within the City of Richmond.

Transportation

Goal: Investigate and employ methods of eliminating transportation deficiencies within the City.

Objectives:

1. Utilize the recommendations of the *Transportation Master Plan* and updates, the *Business District Plan* and recommendations of the *Comprehensive Master Plan*.

2. Increase dialogue with Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT). Encourage cooperation with MDOT on issues related to the City of Richmond.

3. Investigate the potential for a Main Street Trolley bus route.

4. Investigate the possibility of an alternate route for truck traffic.
   - If and when an alternate route is employed, ensure that the downtown businesses are unaffected by:
     - Requiring that uses along it's frontage are non-commercial (and cooperate with surrounding townships if applicable to promote this)
     - Employing directional-signage in appropriate locations to encourage continued use of Downtown Richmond.

BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT ANALYSIS

Outline of Legal Process

The City of Richmond is interested in working with surrounding townships on regional growth management. Such cooperation may involve the need to adjust city boundaries where appropriate. Boundary adjustments should be strategic in nature; the City is concerned with growth patterns and considers encouraging this growth into directly adjacent areas a goal. To promote this, the City has continually sought partnerships with surrounding Townships.

The method of boundary adjustment typically used by communities has been through annexation. With annexation, a community will expand its boundaries by taking in adjoining lands and premises permanently. Under the State Boundary Commission Act, PA 191 of 1968, there are four ways in which an annexation may be initiated: (1) by resolution of the legislative body of the city, (2) by owners of 75% or more of the area proposed for annexation, (3) by petition of 20% of the registered electors in the area proposed for annexation, and (4) by a petition of 1% of the total population of the affected areas as stated in Section 6 of the Home Rule Cities Act, PA 279 of 1909, as amended. The resolution or petition must then be submitted to the State Boundary Commission (SBC)who will determine the compliance of the petition or resolution through a Alegal sufficiency@ hearing. The resolution or petition must consist of a map and description prepared by an engineer or land surveyor, a statement of the reasons for the proposed annexation, and a copy of the resolution by the legislative body of the city. Great care must be taken when preparing the petition or resolution for a proposed annexation as petitions and resolutions often fail to pass the test of legal sufficiency due to errors in mapping the area or transcribing the legal description. Upon passing the test for legal sufficiency, a public hearing is scheduled and compliance with the standards of the SBC for the annexation are presented. Parties on both sides of the issue may submit written arguments and other pertinent information within 30 days of the close of the public hearing. A ruling on the annexation will be made by the SBC during adjudicative meeting.

An alternative to annexation or detachment is P.A. Act 425, which is legislation adopted to promote economic development. Act 425 encourages this development by providing a method for cooperation between cities, villages and townships. Act 425 allows a transfer of land from one unit of government to another for a limited period of time (not to exceed 50 years). This agreement involves an economic development project, including land and existing or planned improvements suitable for use for industrial, commercial and residential development and/or the protection of the environment.

Insert Map 7

Public Act 425 requirements include:

- A written agreement
- Consideration of demographic, physical, economic, projections, and other characteristics of the communities involved
- Public hearing and opportunity for referendum
- Contractual provisions

To meet this growing population, the City has used both annexation and Act 425 agreements. One particular case of annexation that the City was involved with will have effects on all future Act 425 agreements made throughout the State. Based on *Casco Township v Michigan Boundary Commission*, the Michigan Court of Appeals determined that the State Boundary Commission has the jurisdiction and authority to determine the legal validity of an Act 425 agreement and to void an agreement if the Commission determines that it is just a method of avoiding annexation. Because of the ruling, the 425 Agreements between Casco, Columbus and Lenox Townships were deemed invalid and the City of Richmond was able to annex approximately 157 acres along 32 Mile Road and Gratiot Avenue in 1998. The majority of this land remains vacant.

The Muttonville area was annexed in 1989. This area includes all land between 31 and 32 Mile Roads (including properties with frontage on the south-side of 31 Mile) east of the former City limits to the County border. The southern half of this area, surrounding Gratiot, Main and 31 Mile Road are a mix of uses. This range or uses include commercial, residential, agriculture, office, industrial and public uses. However, it is a transition area, serving mostly as a commercial destination.

The dealership property along Gratiot Avenue is another section of the Muttonville area that has been annexed by the City. This annexation followed the expiration of an Act 425 agreement with Lenox Township in December 2000.

The City has also expanded westward. Land between the abandoned Grand Trunk railway and 33 Mile Road, from the City limits to Lowe Plank Road was annexed in 1998.

Currently, the City of Richmond is pursuing Act 425 agreements with its adjoining Townships. The goals in working with these townships are simple:

Goal 1: To encourage compatible planning and growth within a limited and specified area.

Goal 2: To preserve and protect farmland and open space in the townships.

Goal 3: Provide for tax base and service sharing within the PA 425 area.

The City is working to finalize an agreement with Richmond, Casco, and Columbus Townships and will be working very closely with them in promoting smart growth patterns for the future. To promote this smart growth, the City and Townships are negotiating an Urban Limits Agreement. As proposed, all development will occur in a natural order, starting in areas directly surrounding the City and expanding out.

As part of this agreement with Richmond, Casco, and Columbus Townships, the City would annex the City Cemetery. The City also desires to seek friendly annexation of the Wastewater Treatment Plant in Lenox Township and should pursue this effort.

Analysis of Land Uses Surrounding the City

As part of this analysis, a survey was completed in February of 2001 for land uses within an approximate one-half mile of the Richmond City limits. The analysis of the land uses and the quality of the vacant land within these areas was taken into account to determine the suitability and desirability of inclusion within the City. This determination also considers the analysis and conclusions found in previous chapters of this and other Richmond master plans.

Our analysis of adjoining land within one-half mile indicated that there is a mix of uses surrounding the City. A great deal of this land is vacant, though there are residential, commercial and industrial uses, varying by location. The Target Expansion Area Map displays the survey results and includes the areas prioritized for expansion.

Because Richmond Township has been interested in working with the City through Act 425 agreements, the land in these areas are a priority. The majority of the applicable areas are a mix of vacant and residential properties. The vacant areas are used for agricultural purposes or are wooded and/or left fallow. The residential uses, mostly one acre and greater, are both interspersed through fields and woods and directly adjacent in rows of houses.

Township land north of 33 Mile Road and Pound Road reflects this mix. However, one area that stands out here is east of Weeks and just west of the County border. The Hidden Meadow Subdivision is nearing completion. The only access to the subdivision is from Weeks, which is currently a gravel road.

The Richmond Cemetery is also located in Richmond Township just north of the City limits. Located along Main and near the 33 Mile Road intersection, the Cemetery is part of the agreement with the Township and will be annexed into the City as previously noted.

Richmond Township land south of Pound Road and between the City and County limits is mostly vacant and used for agricultural purposes. There are some residences along Pound Road and industrial parcels along the north side of 32 Mile Road.

Richmond Township land west of the City limits and south of 33 Mile Road is a mix of residential and industrial uses along Lowe Plank Road and between Armada Road and Division Road, while agricultural uses can be found west of the Lowe Plank frontage parcels. The majority of parcels adjacent to Armada, Division, and the southern-portion of Lowe Plank are constructed upon due to the heavy use of these roads and appear visually as an extension of the City itself.

This pattern is also seen with the uses that are found within Lenox Township and adjacent to the City. Residential uses are found along each of the roads to a varying degree. Adjacent to the City, residential parcels

are more widespread, with farm fields and woodland behind. Farther from the City these vacant uses become more prevalent and front directly upon the road. A few industrial uses are found along Forest Road and commercial uses sprouting along Gratiot Avenue. Other uses found within Lenox Township include the golf course along Division Road and the wastewater treatment plant on 31 Mile Road.

The majority of land within Casco and Columbus Townships in adjoining areas to the City is wooded. Gratiot Avenue is a mix of these wooded areas and residential and commercial uses in both Townships (and in lands on the west side of Gratiot that were annexed). Pound Road and St. Clair Highway also include homes on one acre lots (approximately) surrounded by woods and farm fields.

Identification of Growth Areas

Upon review and analysis of the land uses and development patterns adjacent to the City limits, priority areas have been established for future expansion. These areas are identified on Map 7. These areas include:

- The City Cemetery located north of Pound Road
- The City Wastewater Treatment Facility located just south of the City, west of Forest Road
- The large land area north of 32 Mile and west of the County line
- The land areas adjacent to the City and west of the Gratiot corridor

One of the main priorities of the City should be to expand its boundaries to include the City Cemetery and the Wastewater Treatment plant facility. Both of these facilities are currently located outside of the City limits, however, they are owned and operated by the City.

One of the major reasons for expansion, as noted in the Property Tax Revenue and Economic Development Analysis, would be to provide land for industrial growth. These sections noted that there is currently a lack of land available and suitable for industrial use. Providing additional land for industrial uses would allow for a greater industrial contribution and a more balanced City budget. The priority area north of 32 Mile and west of the County line would be able to accommodate the need for future industrial growth.

Another priority of the City is to "square off" its boundaries by obtaining the land area north of 32 Mile and west of the Gratiot Avenue corridor. This will enable the City to promote an efficient infrastructure development pattern.

Orderly and sustainable development does not begin or end at the edge of a municipality. Regional influences, availability of infrastructure, development limitations, and codes and ordinances all influence where and how development occurs. Future annexation priorities may be established by the City in the future.

Documentation of Utility and Annexation Policy

The Sewer and Water Analysis discussed improvements and expansion of each utility as based on the Water System and Sanitary Sewer System Master Plan Updates. Each of these improvements was to ensure the transmission of these utilities to the extremities of the system based on the possibility of expansion. Because the extent and areas that were projected for expansion within the utility master plans are different from those recommended within this analysis, the required utilities and improvements that will be required should be evaluated on a cases by case basis. However, because the water and sewer master plans projected expansion far greater than identified in this Plan, less infrastructure improvements will be required. The City should explore updating the Water and Sewer System Master Plans to reflect the boundary expansion identified on Map 7.

BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT ANALYSIS

Key Findings:

- The City of Richmond is interested in expansion opportunities to provide land for the projected-increase in population, to provide additional land for industrial and commercial uses and to promote appropriate growth patterns.

- The City has two opportunities for providing such land. Annexation has been the traditional method of expansion, in which adjoining lands and premises are taken in by the City permanently.

- An alternative to annexation, P.A. 425 was created to promote economic development. A method of providing cooperation between communities, Act 425 allows a temporary transfer of land from one unit of government to another. The agreement between the municipalities involves an economic development project (i.e. utility expansion) and the sharing of tax mills.

- The City of Richmond has employed both annexation and Act 425 agreements. Areas included into the City through these tools include the Muttonville area, land bordering Lowe Plank Road and the City′s west border and parcels along Division Road within St. Clair County.

- The City is looking into Act 425 agreements with it′s surrounding townships to promote appropriate growth patterns and to incorporate the City Cemetery and City Wastewater Treatment Facility. The City has reached an agreement with Richmond Township and are devising an Urban Limits Boundary that both will conform to. Inclusion also considered existing utilities, the "squaring" off of the City to promote efficient infrastructure use and the existing uses within these locations.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

The continued success of any community involves the provision of numerous services and facilities. The planning of community facilities is essential to accommodate the projected growth of the City and to maintain the quality of life of residents.

This section of the Master Plan addresses community facilities, excluding the sanitary sewer system and the water system, which are addressed in separate sections of the Master Plan. The purpose of this analysis is to describe the condition of existing community facilities and determine the adequacy of the facilities in meeting the needs of the community.

The City of Richmond offers a wide range of government services. The most vital services required for the effective operation of a community are provided by the government. These services include fire and police protection, street maintenance, the judicial system, and mail delivery.

City Hall
The administrative office for the City is located in a converted bank building located at 68225 Main Street. The City is currently investigating alternatives to this location due to site constraints. These alternatives include expansion into the neighboring Laundromat or construction of a new building on a new site. A total of 16 employees work in the building at this time. The City Hall should continue to be located in a central location for easy accessibility to all residents and business owners.

Police and Fire
The Richmond Police Department shares a building with the Michigan State Police Department, located at 36725 Division Road. The building, funded through Tax Increment Finance Authority monies, was constructed in 1995. The State Police leases space from the City. The Police Department includes a police chief, two sergeants, six patrol officers and three full-time and four part-time civilian dispatchers. An additional twenty reserve officers, six crossing guards and one maintenance employee work part-time. The Fire Station is located on 69435 Main Street just south of Churchill Street and includes restoration work completed on the outside brick and bell tower. Current needs of the Police and Fire Departments are being met by these facilities.

Department of Public Works
The DPW facility is located at 69129 Beebe Street. The facility includes the motor pool building with offices and the map/print room, the meter building and the garage. The DPW provides street maintenance, operates and maintains the City cemetery, the waste water collection system, the water distribution system, and parks and recreation facilities. Current staff includes a full time director, one full time maintenance, one crew leader, one sexton/mechanic, one us1s (utility service category-1) and five us2s . Existing facilities and employees meet the current needs of the Department, however, these facilities are located within a predominately single family residential area and may consider relocating to a more appropriate industrial area in the future.

Insert Map 8

Post Office
The post office is located at 36511 Division Road, west of the Police Station. The post office moved to the former SEMCO Energy site in 2000 after construction of a new facility. Existing needs are met by the facility.

Library
Lois Wagner Memorial Library located at 35200 Division Road was constructed in 1974. A renovation of the library in 1992 doubled the floor area of the original building. The library is also being considered within the facilities study that the City is currently preparing.

Cemetery
The City owns and operates a cemetery at 71000 Main Street just outside of the City limits. The cemetery includes the cemetery chapel, storage building and mausoleum. The City is currently investigating methods to incorporate the cemetery into Richmond.

Schools
Richmond Community Schools are located on a 60-acre site south of Division Street and west of Main Street. The site includes the elementary, middle and high schools of the Richmond Community School District. This District covers areas of Richmond, Lenox, Casco, and Columbus townships. The site includes recreation facilities like football fields, soccer fields, basketball courts, and various playground equipment.

Richmond Center for the Performing Arts
The Center is located in the historic and National Register-listed First Congregational Church at 69619 Parker. The building houses four theater company performances a year as well as numerous special events.

Parks and Recreational Facilities
The City owns and operates three separate recreation sites.

- Beebe Street Memorial Park is the largest park, encompassing 38.5 acres in the east-central section of the City. It serves the City as a community park. The two major features of the park are five baseball fields and an outdoor swimming pool. Beebe Street Memorial Park is located two blocks east of Main Street (M-19) and three blocks north of Division Street (32 Mile Road). The park also includes a hike/bike trail for pedestrian use.

- Bailey Park is a two-acre site immediately west of Beebe Street Memorial Park. Four lighted tennis courts (the only public courts in the City), a baseball field and a soccer field are the main features of this neighborhood park. The Richmond Historical Society maintain the historical buildings that have been moved to the park.

- Gierk Park is located on Gierk Avenue on the south side of the City. Occupying approximately one acre, this neighborhood park features a bird sanctuary and play equipment for children.

Other park facilities planned for the City include the Macomb Orchard Trail and the Well # 8 property.

The three Richmond District school sites include several recreational facilities. These include football fields, soccer fields, track and field facilities, softball fields, baseball fields, basketball courts and various playground equipment. St. Augustine Catholic Elementary School and St. Peter Lutheran School also offer playground equipment, basketball hoops and other recreational facilities. The recreational uses of these sites are mainly for students of the respective schools, though these facilities can be used to the general public under specific and limited conditions.

There are many other recreational facilities available to residents as well. Golf courses, a bowling alley and a riding stable are three examples of private facilities within the area. There are many regional facilities within an hour drive that residents may utilize. Lakeport State Park, Stoney Creek Metro Park and Freedom Hill are just a few examples of State parks, Huron-Clinton Metropolitan Authority and County parks (respectively) within a short distance of the City.

According to the 2000 *Parks and Recreation Plan*, the parks are sufficient in serving many needs of the City′ s residents. Particular conclusions and recommendations based on current and/or future deficiencies include:

- There is a sufficient amount of land within the City to serve the current recreation needs of residents. However, land within the northern and western areas of the City and south of Division Road east of the Grand Trunk intersection are not within the service areas of these parks. Additional recreational land and facilities are necessary (particularly neighborhood parks) to meet these needs and will become necessary with the projected growth of population and extension of City boundaries.

- The lack of indoor recreational facilities should be addressed. The heavy demand of these facilities and the possibility of extending recreation programming throughout the year should be a consideration of this.

- Richmond includes a number of trails for pedestrian use, including the trail in Beebe Park, the trail in the woods behind the elementary school and upon completion, the rail trail. Dedication of additional paths for walking, running or biking should be considered to promote pedestrian friendliness.

- Additional recreational facilities of the City are deficient. The following table, found in the *Parks and Recreation Plan* demonstrates these particular facilities.

Table 14
Recreation Facilities Evaluation

	Recommended Standard*	Existing Municipal Facilities	Existing School Facilities	Existing Private Sites	Total Existing Facilities	Public Need** City	Public Need** Service Area	Surplus/Deficiency^^ City	Surplus/Deficiency^^ Service Area
Basketball Courts	1 per 5,000	3	13	0	16	1	5	15	11
Tennis Courts	1 per 2,000	4	0	0	4	3	12	1	-8
Volleyball Courts	1 per 5,000	2	0	0	2	1	5	1	-3
Baseball / Softball Diamonds	1 per 5,000	6	8	0	14	1	5	13	9
Lighted Diamonds	1 per 30,000	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0
Football Fields	1 per 20,000	0	2	0	2	1	1	1	1
Soccer Fields (regulation)	1 per 10,000	2	5	0	7	1	2	6	5
Golf Courses (9 holes) ^	1 per 25,000	0	0	0	0	1	1	-1	-1
Golf Courses (18 holes) ^	1 per 50,000	0	0	2	0	1	1	1	1
Driving Ranges	1 per 50,000	0	0	0	0	1	1	-1	-1
Swimming Pools (Indoor)	1 per 20,000	0	0	0	0	1	1	-1	-1
Swimming Pools (Outdoor)	1 per 40,000	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0
Ice Rinks (Indoor)	1 per 50,000	0	0	0	0	1	1	-1	-1
Ice Rinks (Outdoor)	1 per 20,000	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
Archery Ranges	1 per 50,000	0	0	0	0	1	1	-1	-1
Running Tracks (1/4 mile) 5	1 per 20,000	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0
Playgrounds	1 per 3,000	2	4	0	6	2	8	4	-2
Picnic Areas	None Published	1	0	0	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cross-Country Ski Trails (miles)	1 per 10,000	0	0	0	0	1	2	-1	-2
Nature Trails (miles)	1 per 20,000	0	0	0	0	1	1	-1	-1
Sledding Hill	1 per 40,000	0	0	0	0	1	1	-1	-1
Bicycle Trails (miles)	1 per 40,000	0	0	0	0	1	1	-1	-1
Horseback Riding Trails (miles)	1 per 50,000	0	0	0	0	1	1	-1	-1

* Recommended number of each facility per unit of population (National Recreation and Park Association/MI Recreation Opportunity Standards).

** Based on estimated population for year 2000

^ Includes public and private courses.

^^ Surplus/(Deficiency) determined by subtracting existing municipal facilities from recommended need.

MAIN STREET AND GRATIOT AVENUE CORRIDOR PLANS

Current and Projected Traffic Needs

The population of the City, as discussed within the Population Analysis section of the Master Plan, will continue to increase. In 1990 the population was 4,141 with 1,540 households. The increases from 1990 to 2000 were projected at 784 new people and 463 new households. By 2020, SEMCOG estimates that the population will be 7,906 with 1,902 households (an increase of 3,765 and 362 respectively).

The population and household increases of the City of Richmond will be seen in surrounding Townships as well. Richmond Township will see a similar increase, growing from a population of 2,528 to 3,286 (an increase of 758) with the number of households increasing from 756 to 1,078 (an increase of 322). However, SEMCOG's 2020 estimates for the Township, with a projected population of 4,073 and 1,249 households, are much lower than the same estimate for the City. The largest increases were projected by SEMCOG to occur within Lenox and Columbus Townships, with increases of 2,355 residents and 558 households for Lenox and 1,314 residents and 523 households for Columbus.

The increases in Richmond and in surrounding communities will have varying effects on the City. Because these surrounding communities are largely rural in nature, the City will become a draw to these new residents. Thus, the downtown and local businesses may receive increased usage. The amount of such largely depends on the range of services and businesses and the quality and usability of the Downtown and Muttonville businesses.

Because Main Street and Gratiot Avenue are vital routes connecting I-69, the Village of Memphis and points north with I-94 and all areas south of the City, traffic will likely increase along these routes. The amount of this traffic that is through-traffic and does not stop within the City may be considerable. This would add to the large amount of through-traffic that currently exists and decrease the usability (decreasing pedestrian friendliness, aesthetics and such) of the streets and adjoining uses.

Thus, in many ways the negative aspects of the population increases of Richmond and surrounding areas may negate the possible positive aspects. Thus analysis of the Main Street and Gratiot Avenue corridors is vital. The 1997 *Business District Master Plan* discussed these issues and developed particular standards and goals which the City could take to encourage these positive aspects and encourage growth and usage of the City's business districts. The 2009 *Gratiot Avenue Corridor Improvement Plan* specifically discusses the conditions and provides recommendations regarding future access, transit and non-motorized elements along the corridor in an effort to maximize efficiency of travel and improve safety on Gratiot Avenue. The findings from these Plans are discussed later in this Section.

Insert Map 9

The City is currently in the process of updating their Master Thoroughfare Plan. Any findings, policies, and recommendations of the Master Thoroughfare Plan should be based upon the recommendations of the Master Plan.

Review of Current Business District Master Plans

1997 *Economic Development Strategic Plan*

One goal of the *Economic Development Strategic Plan* was to enhance Richmond′s commercial and retail opportunities to attract customers and users of commercial services from throughout Macomb and St. Clair Counties. To encourage this, a streetscape improvement plan for lighting and signage and a plan to determine redevelopment possibilities for critical sites and buildings were suggested. Following this, the City has continued to work with MDOT for improvements and the *Business District Master Plan* was created. The Master Plan included data and recommendations for each street that can be included with this analysis.

The Plan notes that the north (Historic) and central (Granary) Main Street Districts located between Madison and Howard Streets are the downtown business areas. The Plan states that "a good stock of historic buildings and community of well-kept homes provides the impetus to continue to market and develop Richmond as a truly Midwestern historic city with authentic Main Street shopping and restaurants. This "Main Street" niche can create the destination orientation the district needs." Thus, it is imperative that "proper planning and a real working coalition of the merchants, landlords and the City of Richmond" are provided to allow Main Street to thrive.

The Plan had the following comments and recommendations for Main Street:

Within the northern, "Historic" segment of the Main Street District are two areas: The area north of Water Street has many traits which lend it to be a continuation of the core retail area. The Signature Street Clock, the proud symbol of the City, is a strong historical anchor for the area. The southern area of this district, centering around the Division Road-Main Street intersection is heavily traveled and lends itself to the existing mix of convenience/stop and go services. The widening of Division Road has provided an opportunity to introduce streetscape and pedestrian crossing improvements. The construction of the trail along the abandoned railway as projected for completion within the next five years will result in greater pedestrian usage in the area and will require these pedestrian crossing improvements to occur. Redevelopment on the corners of the intersection has occurred, including a fueling station on the northeast corner.

- Brick pavers, street trees, ornamental lighting, appropriate awnings and signs, and restoration and repair of original building facades would vastly improve the streetscape of this area.

The central, Granary segment of the Main Street District lends itself to be the core for a revitalized Main Street. The City Offices provide a service and employment destination. The proximity of surrounding residential areas encourage a node that pedestrians can walk to and the landmark St. Augustine Church provides a cultural and architectural anchor.

- The analysis recommends adaptive reuse of existing structures to enhance and expand the existing trade area.

The Gratiot Corridor, discussed as the "Muttonville" area within the Plan is currently and will remain higher intensity with community wide commercial uses and a more auto-oriented design. Auto dealerships, big box retail and large grocery stores would be welcomed in this area of the City.

- Though not dependant on pedestrian traffic, sidewalks should be provided which connect to the sidewalk networks of the Granary and Historic Districts. Street trees and a grass strip provided between the sidewalks and roadway would provide pedestrian comfort and safety.

- This same landscaping, coupled with appropriate signing and building appearance would provide an attractive appearance for the Muttonville Business District and entrance into Richmond.

In regards to parking, the analysis found that adequate parking was available in and around the Main Street District. It was recommended that:

- New signage and landscaping be placed in and around parking areas to encourage more efficient use and greater aesthetics.

- Rear parking be used whenever possible in the north and central Main Street areas; enhanced with additional lighting, directional signage, new paving, striping, curbs, landscaping, greater pedestrian access and entrance and layout improvements.

In order to ensure a viable downtown, the City must ensure adequate parking will continue to be available.

The Plan also recommended:

- Promotional activities and marketing
- Unified design themes within the nodes
- Outdoor cafes and display of merchandise on side-walked areas of large width
- Vertical elements of planted, curbed islands and medians to define circulation
- Leasing incentives and tenant improvements
- A directional sign to the Historic Richmond Business District south of the corner of Gratiot Avenue and Main Street to draw attention to the full extent of the Richmond Business District.
- Maintaining the residential appearance between business districts. This includes when using residences for offices.

It was concluded that if all of these programs and improvements were enacted properly, competition between the Main Street and Gratiot area (as well as Port Huron, Lakeside Mall and such) would be lessened, a tourist trade could be created and greater employment and sales would be provided for the local economy.

Based on these recommendations, the City has and will continue to make improvements. These improvements include consistent and historic-style lighting fixtures, replacement of existing sidewalks with traditional sidewalks, brick pavers, new signage (including at the entrances to the City′ s business districts) and the use of street trees. These streetscape improvements are being funded from TIFA and MDOT monies.

2009 *Gratiot Avenue Corridor Improvement Plan*

In partnership with Macomb County and the Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG), the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) developed an access management plan for those segments of Gratiot Avenue located in Macomb County. The plan vision is to restore and preserve road capacity, improve safety conditions, and support the long-term vision for expanded regional transit, non-motorized systems and community sustainability.

Gratiot experiences periodic congestion along several segments and there are locations with a relatively high number of crashes. Some of the crashes and congestion along Gratiot are due to conflicts created where vehicles are entering or exiting access points, disruptions to the flow of traffic and pedestrians traveling along the street. Those conflicts, and thus the potential for crashes and congestion, can be reduced through standards on the number, placement, and design of access points (intersecting streets, median crossovers and commercial driveways).

Access management is a key tool to improve transportation conditions and safety for all users. While the concept can be applied on any road, this plan includes guidelines, regulations, and site-specific recommendations for property along Gratiot Avenue. In a general sense, the recommendations for Gratiot Avenue, which are summarized in the Gratiot Avenue recommendations below, could be applied to other roads in the City. Implementation will occur through a coordinated effort between MDOT, the Road Commission of Macomb County, and each of the nine communities involved in this process, as development proposals, road projects, transit enhancements and other opportunities arise.

To achieve prescribed benefits, access guidelines must recognize the following principles:

- Design for efficient access. Identify driveway design criteria that promote safe and efficient ingress and egress at driveways, while considering the interaction with pedestrians and bicyclists.
- Separate the conflict areas. Reduce the number of driveways, increase the spacing between driveways and between driveways and intersections, and reduce the number of poorly aligned driveways.
- Remove turning vehicles or queues from the through lanes. Reduce both the frequency and severity of conflicts by providing separate paths and storage areas for turning vehicles and queues.
- Limit the types of conflicts. Reduce the frequency of conflicts or reduce the area of conflict at some or all driveways by limiting or preventing certain kinds of maneuvers.
- Provide reasonable access. Recognize that property owners have an inherent right to access public roadways, although reasonable access may be indirect in some instances.

Access management can contribute to more livable streets in the City. Pedestrian and transit environments are enhanced by strategic placement and design of driveways and where driveways are removed or relocated, green infrastructure applications can be used to improve environmental sustainability. On a broader scale, all of these elements are needed to provide the desired multi-modal environment, and should be coordinated with development applications as they arise on Gratiot Avenue. And, while general in nature, the non-motorized, transit and green infrastructure recommendations given are intended to complement access management efforts where appropriate.

Corridor Plan Findings and Recommendations

The Main Street and Gratiot Avenue Corridor Plans are based on our analysis and the previous discussions found in this and other Master Plans (Transportation, Utilities, etc.) completed for the City. Many of the recommendations found within these plans continue to remain applicable to these corridors and will be included with these discussions.

The City has accomplished some of it earlier goals to study access management and promote sustainable development. To further these goals, continued cooperation is needed with adjacent communities to identify goals and issues, limit access and identify alternative transportation routes. Regional efforts to improve transit and non-motorized systems will likely involve the City of Richmond given its location along the Macomb Orchard Trail. While most regional trail efforts are spearheaded at the County or regional level, the City should still work on a local level toward a complete system of sidewalks and pathways that round out any regional systems, while considering transit and green infrastructure as well.

Main Street Corridor

Main Street is the main corridor running within the City. Main Street is home to the City's downtown and many of the City's residents live on or within a few blocks of it. The street, designated as M-19 by the State, is a vital through-route for the area connecting points south with the Village of Memphis, I-69, and other points north.

There are a wide range of uses fronting on Main Street. The majority of these uses are single family residential or commercial properties, though public, office and industrial uses also front on Main. The following table includes the makeup of uses by site for the downtown area of Main.

Table 15
Existing Land Use
Main Street-from Gratiot Avenue to Madison Street

Use	Percent of Sites
Single Family Residential	45%
Commercial	43%
Public	4%
Office	5%
Industrial	1%

*Figures based on site by site analysis and do not reflect individual uses on one site (i.e. the large commercial shopping center in Muttonville does not specify the smaller businesses that are included within it).

Because there are no alternate routes north, Main Street caries a heavy load of traffic. This is positive in providing potential customers to the area businesses. However, because a great deal of this traffic is through-traffic, the businesses do not reap the benefits of such. This traffic makes it difficult for local traffic to enter onto the street or make left turns. In addition, this large volume of traffic discourages walk-ability.

The three business segments of the City are all predominately served by the street and each have a distinct role within the City. In addition, there are a large number of single-family residences which front onto the street. These expanses of homes stretch from southeast of George Street to the north-City border and serve in separating the business district into three distinct segments. Most of the residences are sixty years or older and are found on smaller lots. These residences, combined with sidewalks, street trees and business and employment destinations within walking distance provide the traditional style and feel that residents expressed great interest in at the Vision Session. Some of these homes have been converted to offices but continue to reflect the residential appearance.

The northern segment of the business district has a unique niche as the Historic segment, providing shops and restaurants within historic buildings. In addition, it includes the high profile Main Street and Division Road intersection. Based on this, this segment of the City serves as a commercial draw, both for customers wishing to walk around and shop and customers in a hurry on their way home from work or passing through town. The role as pedestrian draw will increase in the near future with the construction of the pedestrian trail stretching from the Division and Main intersection westward beyond the City limits.

The central segment′ s niche is as an employment and service destination. The Granary district, home to City Hall and the grain elevator in which it gets its name, is also a commercial destination. This section of Richmond best reflects the small town and rural atmosphere that residents frequently mention as one reason they love the City.

The southern segment of Main Street provides an area for higher-intensity commercial uses and serves as the southern-entry point into Richmond. Included into the City as part of the 1989 "Muttonville" annexation, this section of the City is designed with auto-oriented uses in mind. This includes big-box retail, large grocery stores and such which have become trends in many outlying areas of communities. Because the southern-segment is located along the Main Street and Gratiot Avenue intersection, it is also the focus of the Gratiot Corridor analysis.

Residents had many comments regarding Main Street or relatable to the Corridor that were expressed through the Vision Session and Surveys. Residents praised the "small town atmosphere", available shopping services, tree-lined streets, and walk-ability, all reflected along Main Street. However, residents believed that the volume of traffic and not enough planning for historic preservation were negative points.

Furthermore, residents believed that downtown development and neighborhood retail/service uses should be encouraged. Residents were concerned of a loss of open space in other areas of the City with the growing use of subdivisions. Based on these results, it appears that residents want the traditional traits of the City to be furthered and future growth to be linked to and serve as an effective compromise to the downtown. To promote this, reuse of existing buildings and empty sites along Main Street should be continually encouraged. Businesses should be convenient for use within these neighborhoods.

Based on these considerations our recommendations for the Main Street Corridor are as follows. Many of the individual recommendations could apply to each topic.

Preserve Richmond's Heritage

1. Restore the facades of the City's historic buildings, especially within the Historic and Granary districts. Encourage rehabilitation and use of existing buildings over construction of new buildings through incentive programs. This would eliminate the substandard and deteriorated conditions of some of the structures along Main Street as new tenants moved in or existing tenants fixed up the facilities.

2. New buildings should reflect the historic past of the City and should attempt to continue a consistent theme throughout the Main Street Corridor. Although there are few unbuilt lots along Main, this is applicable for infill, in cases when structures may not be appropriate for the Corridor or for the business needs of the community, and in any City expansion north of the City.

3. Preserve and reuse the granary, for agriculture, office, retail or an appropriate mix of each. If reuse of the complex is not financially feasible the City may have to subsidize its reuse as a community landmark.

4. Investigate and utilize historic preservation programs and tools. Create a Historic District Study Committee and Historic District Commission, participate in the Certified Local Government Program, establish a Historic Overlay District and/or look into Preservation Tax Incentives Programs. Each of these programs, depending on which particular program or programs chosen, would provide the City and local business owners and residents with methods of and provide incentives for preserving structures.

5. Preserve residences between Districts including overall appearance of such when converted to office.

Encourage Usage of Richmond's Business Districts

1. Continue to redevelop properties, especially at high-profile corner locations. In redeveloping these properties, provide the consistent traditional theme discussed above.

2. Continue to provide adequate parking within the downtown area.

3. Employ proper signage along the entire corridor. This includes a directional sign at the Main Street and Gratiot Avenue intersection which the City is providing.

4. Encourage mixed-uses downtown by maintaining residential and office uses on the second floor of businesses to promote a lively and thriving appearance of Richmond.

Promote Walk-ability

1. Ensure that new development is street oriented.

2. Provide pedestrians with window displays and interesting views, especially within the northern and central segments of the business districts. Cater buildings to pedestrians, with awnings and no front setbacks. Allow business owners to place sandwich-style advertisements or signs along the sidewalks and/or place their products outside of the store.

3. Provide usability of sidewalks for all types of residents, with street trees, benches and proper maintenance.

4. Promote a consistent pedestrian theme throughout the corridor, extending from the northern extent of the City through Muttonville. This theme should include consistent sidewalks, lighting styles and such which would link the one edge of the City with the other.

5. Link sidewalks with the planned trail starting at the Main Street and Division Road intersection. Provide a sign at this intersection and continue to utilize the City-owned land at the intersection.

6. Continue to improve crosswalks along the entire corridor and provide additional crosswalks which are or may become necessary. Sidewalk extensions should be provided on each side of the street to minimize the crossing distance and any pedestrian crossings at intersections with traffic lights should have button activated pedestrian sequences.

7. Find an effective compromise between vehicular and pedestrian traffic.

Address Traffic Concerns

1. Because traffic was the largest concern expressed by residents, continue to look for alternatives. Include the public in decision making and inform the public of proposed changes.

2. Continue to work with MDOT to investigate traffic calming devices and signalization to minimize negative impacts of vehicular traffic.

3. Continue updating the *Master Thoroughfare Plan* and employ the recommendations of each update. If this option is not utilized, make sure that traffic counts and intersection studies are performed regularly to receive up-to-date information.

4. Investigate alternative road patterns throughout the City.

5. Ensure that emergency vehicles have access alternatives throughout the City. One particular concern is that there are only two Grand Trunk Railroad crossings within the City.

6. Limit the number of access drives within all areas of the City. Develop a plan to encourage sharing of access drives for businesses and residences.

7. Promote linkage between the "Muttonville" Business District and the "Historic" and "Granary" Business Districts.

    a. Many of the tools to promote this linkage have been previously noted with the other recommendations. However, this linkage is important enough to reiterate separately. Muttonville has been a section of Richmond since it was annexed by the City in 1989 and is a vital part of the Main Street Corridor as it serves as the south entrance into the City. Thus the City must ensure that the district is a proper compromise with the other business districts.

b. Construct new sidewalks, street trees, lighting and such to connect with those found in the other segments of the City.

c. Require appropriate landscaping to ensure that screening concerns are properly addressed.

d. Require new construction to reflect the traditional themes found in the other segments of the City. This would include using brick for building facades, pushing the buildings forward and closer to the road and "hiding" parking (with screening).

e. However, in providing for this linkage it is important to remember that this area is going to be used by "big-box" retailers and other auto-oriented uses. The City must ensure that these uses will be reserved for this area only. Auto-oriented uses such as these should not be permitted in the other districts of the City.

Gratiot Avenue Corridor

As discussed previously, the Gratiot Avenue and Main Street intersection is currently the focus of the Gratiot Avenue Corridor. This intersection is the center of activity for the Corridor, and is surrounded by various high-intensity commercial uses. As noted before, it is also the southern entry into the City.

However, the uses being limited to this section of the Corridor may change within the near future. The annexation of the large parcels of land at the Gratiot Avenue and Division Road intersection and the possibility of further City expansion along the road requires that this corridor study include the whole stretch of Gratiot; from the south City border to just beyond Division Road.

There is a mix of uses found within these areas as well. The majority of the land is vacant, with woods and agricultural uses making up this vacancy. Residential and commercial uses can also be found, though at a lesser degree than that found at the Main and Gratiot intersection.

The several signalized intersections in Richmond experienced various types of crashes between 2005-2007. However, none of the fully signalized intersections in Richmond meet or exceed the critical crash ratio (i.e. none are among the highest crash rate intersections along the corridor) established by SEMCOG.

One segment of Gratiot Avenue, between Main Street and County Line Road, exceeded the critical crash rate and frequency. There were a high number of angle and head-on left-turn crashes in this Muttonville area. Most occurred at the intersection of Gratiot Avenue with Muttonville Lane as well as with County Line Road. The angle of County Line Road with Gratiot Avenue is most likely contributing to the crashes at this intersection. While there is not a significant congestion issue, the number and configuration of the intersections in this area cause confusion and there is a fair amount of induced congestion due to the driveways that can't be modeled. There were several intersection configurations that were tested using computer traffic modeling software Synchro/SimTraffic. Four alternatives were developed to help address crashes and congestion in the area:

- Alternative 1: Raised median on Gratiot between 31-Mile and Main to prohibit mid-block left turns.
- Alternative 2: Offset intersections at Countyline/Muttonville.
- Alternative 3: Roundabout at Countyline/Muttonville with Main as one-way and Muttonville to two-way.
- Alternative 4: Roundabout at Countyline/Muttonville with removal of Main.

Alternative 1 could not be modeled within Synchro/Simtraffic since driveways are not modeled. This is a short-term alternative that is recommended for Gratiot Avenue between Main Street and 31 Mile Road. A raised median would eliminate any left-turning movements except at the signalized intersections thereby reducing the number of conflicts and induced congestion in the area. Longer term solutions are Alternatives 2-4. Each alternative was input into Synchro/Simtraffic to determine the number of lanes and general configuration and updated signal timings in order to make the computer model function with a LOS D or better for all intersections.

Alternative 2 has an increase in all measures of effectiveness,

Alternative Intersection Concepts:

Alternative 1:

Alternative 2:

Alternative 3:

Alternative 4:

is the least costly of the alternatives and increases the safety of the Muttonville/County Line Road intersections. The amount of delay for the network increases due to the intersections of Muttonville Road and County Line Road becoming signalized. The roundabout alternatives (Alternatives 3 and 4) significantly decrease the amount of delay and travel time in the corridor, as well as the number of stops. The roundabout alternatives are more expensive and may have some right-of-way implications as well. More extensive study of these and other alternatives would be required before final design and construction could occur. In order for an alternative intersection design to be implemented, it must first be listed in SEMCOG's Long Range Plan (LRP), and MDOT's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP). This process would involve the City, SEMCOG and MDOT, as outlined below:

1. Maintain communication with SEMCOG to alert them to the city's intentions, and determine what criteria SEMCOG uses to select projects. They will be involved in the process, so involving SEMCOG early is advised.
2. Alternatives should be closely evaluated to identify the recommended alternative. A more detailed study of the project, including traffic modeling, etc, should be conducted to prove a need for and identify the benefits of each alternative. Becausse SEMCOG is the agency that will ultimately place the project on the Long Range Plan (LRP) and TIP, the study needs to follow their selection criteria to ensure the outcome is compatible with their process.
3. Submit the project to SEMCOG for consideration during their next programming interval.
4. If selected by SEMCOG and the project is placed on the Long Range Plan, the next step is to secure funding for the project and have it placed on MDOT's Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP). The TIP is constrained by how much funding is available, so the stronger the need for the project, the more likely it will be placed on the TIP.
5. Once funding is secured and project is in the TIP, the final steps are to finalize the design, perform Environmental Impact Studies, and execute the project.

This Master Plan promotes two themes for Gratiot Avenue:

1. Promote a common theme throughout the entire "Muttonville" Business District.

    a. The design themes discussed within the Main Street Corridor for Muttonville should apply along Gratiot Avenue as well. This includes sidewalks, lighting, street trees and such to connect with those found along Main Street.

    b. To ease traffic concerns, limit the number of access drives onto Gratiot Avenue. Promote the sharing of access and limit the number of properties which have their own access drive.

    c. Require appropriate landscaping to ensure that screening concerns are properly addressed.

    d. Require new construction to reflect the traditional themes found in the other segments of the City. This would include using brick for building facades, pushing the buildings forward and closer to the road and "hiding" parking (with screening).

2. Additional Consideration Points

a. Provide an access for the Lake Angela subdivision along Gratiot Avenue. This could be provided by an access drive or linkage to a future-development circulation plan. Provision of this depends on the owner of the adjacent parcel in Casco Township, the future use of the parcel and whether Richmond ever has any say in the planning of this parcel (through annexation or Act 425 agreements).

b. The intersections found within the Gratiot Avenue Corridor are all serviced by traffic signalization. The Master Transportation Plan determined that each was at a good level of service (31 Mile was recommended for signalization in the Plan and has since been provided).

c. The land uses determined for the recently annexed lands along Gratiot Avenue and for any additional lands that the City may annex or receive through Act 425 agreements along Gratiot would have effects on the recommendations to be made.

MAIN STREET AND GRATIOT AVENUE CORRIDOR PLANS

Key Findings:

- The importance of the Main Street and Gratiot Avenue Corridors will continue to gain significance as the population of the City and surrounding communities increase. A higher population will mean greater usage of the City′s Business Districts but also more local and through-traffic.

- The 1996 *Master Transportation Plan* found that the City′s overall transportation network operated well. Particular concerns within some of the City′s intersections have been addressed by the City.

- Congestion and a large amount of traffic are two remaining concerns. Methods of countering these problems, including signalization and alternate truck routes have met opposition or have not been feasible.

- Many recommendations for Main Street and Gratiot Avenue reflect those found in the *Business District Master Plan*. Continuing to encourage a traditional theme with sidewalks, street trees, "hidden" off-street parking, traditional facades and materials and such were all recommended throughout the Main Street Corridor. The Muttonville area should reflect these themes while providing for uses that other segments of the City cannot.

- It is recommended that other alternatives, like intersection closings, limited numbers of access drives by sharing, and similar be investigated.

Additional recommendations from the Gratiot Avenue Corridor Improvement Plan include those for access, non-motorized, transit and green infrastructure, and are intended to be implemented over time, as development applications are reviewed by the City. It is anticipated that the majority of changes will occur as part of a private-property owner's request; however, it is also possible to implement the changes with future road reconstruction projects or through MDOT if existing conditions create a safety hazard that must be addressed.

The maps on pages 17 and 18 illustrate site-specific recommendations for access management, including ways to improve the relationship between vehicle access and non-motorized and transit facilities.

The recommendations below for access, non-motorized, transit and green infrastructure have been summarized for inclusion in this plan. However, the City of Richmond has adopted the full Plan, wherein the following recommendations are discussed in further detail.

Access Recommendations

As most of the land area within the City limits along Gratiot is developed, the recommendations in this plan focus on forging cross-connections between adjacent businesses and improving the current access patterns through closure and consolidation of driveways. The commercial development on the southeast and southwest corners of 31 Mile Road intersection present the most apparent opportunity, as the two

businesses on the southeast corner have been vacant and may be difficult to use without redevelopment or renovation. The larger Kroger-anchored shopping center behind these properties has internal circulation, and the illustrative recommendations show several potential points for cross access when redevelopment occurs.

Access management can be accomplished through a variety of techniques, both physical and regulatory. Specific recommendations that consider existing access points along Gratiot and potential new ones are illustrated on a series of drawings contained within the chapter for each community. Recommendations and regulations are based on the following techniques.

- Properly Space Driveways from Other Driveways
- Limit Number of Access Points
- Properly Space Driveways from Intersections
- Design Access Points to Properly Direct Traffic and Protect Pedestrians
- Encourage Shared Driveways and Cross-Access
- Promote Service Drives
- Directly Align or Properly Offset Driveways from Opposing Driveways Across the Road
- Promote New Median Design Concept
- Provide Sidewalk Connections to Public System

Because the above recommendations are based on the conditions at the time this plan was developed, a significant change in conditions along the corridor should prompt a thorough consideration of any proposed project in the context of the policies, standards, and goals of this plan. The City, MDOT, and the County will play an important role in reviewing development proposals along this corridor to promote more efficient and safe access.

Non-Motorized Conditions

All new development in the City is required to construct sidewalks along street frontage, which should resolve gaps on and near Gratiot as development occurs. Due to limited right-of-way width through most of the city, the distance between the sidewalk and street are often less than 10 feet. Landscaping and streetscape elements could help promote a feeling of safety for pedestrians and bicyclists along Gratiot in the city.

While providing sidewalks and pathways is a common goal, designing any non-motorized system requires careful planning that considers safety, efficiency, convenience and cost v. benefit. It is important to provide clearly delineated areas both along the corridor and within private commercial developments, especially in areas where vehicular traffic is high. When planning for future non-motorized systems, communities should follow the guidelines listed below.

- Design Access Points in Consideration of Pedestrians/Bicyclists.
- Delineate Driveway Crossings with Noticeable Markings or Pavement.
- Implement Mid-block Non-Motorized Crossings in High-Traffic Pedestrian Areas.
- Promote Connectivity Within the Non-Motorized System.
- Incorporate Amenities Like Bike Racks and Benches for Bicyclists.

Transit Access Design Guidelines

SMART (Suburban Mobility Authority for Regional Transportation) offers bus routes throughout Macomb County. No fixed line service is provided in Richmond, although a daily shuttle is offered through a partnership with the Richmond Lenox EMS. Shuttle stops are located at select locations north of Hall Road/M-59 with the closest stop located at the Lenox Township Hall. Shuttles travel to 23 Mile Road where fixed service begins. Sidewalk connections and other amenities should be provided at select stop locations as opportunities arise. The following is a summary of transit facilities standards related to access management to support transit and pedestrian flow, especially around higher use transit stops.

- Improve Visibility and Safety of Transit Stop Locations.
- Provide Non-Motorized Connections to Transit Stops.
- Encourage Large Commercial Businesses to Provide Park and Ride Lots.
- Reduce Walking Distances to Local Destinations and Commercial Nodes.
- Consider Regional Transit Plans.

Green Infrastructure Design Guidelines

While discussion of green infrastructure is provided in a general context within this plan, the design of these systems is very site specific. While low impact design is encouraged wherever it can be applied along the corridor, it is specifically warranted in areas where vegetation may be installed in lieu of impervious surfaces (i.e. pavement). In all situations, a clear understanding of the regulatory authorities that may require review, approval and permitting for green infrastructure techniques is necessary. For more detailed design criteria, please review SEMCOG's Low Impact Development Manual (A Design Guide for Implementation and Reviewers).

- Use Bioretention (Rain Gardens) & Bioswales.
- Incorporate Native Street Tree Planters.
- Replace Asphalt and Concrete with Porous Pavement.

Insert Tile 10 of Maps

Insert Tile 11 of Maps

FUTURE LAND USE PLAN

Delineation of the future land use designations are a primary reason for completing the master plan. These designations, based on the findings of the plan and carefully selected by the Planning Commission, will serve as a guide for all future land use decisions. A summary of these findings and the policies in which the Future Land Use Plan addresses these findings is as follows.

Summary of Findings

The population of Richmond, and subsequently the number of housing units, continues to grow. An increase of 756 people and 437 households occurred between 1990 and 2000, a growth of approximately 18% and 28%, respectively. New housing unit construction has been able to meet this population growth. These new units have included a greater provision of multiple family units, which has been helpful in providing housing to all segments of the City's population. Two demographic groups remain underserved by existing housing, including young families/first time homebuyers and seniors.

This population growth is expected to continue. The City is projected to increase by 57.0% or 2,785 people from 1990 to 2030, nearly a doubling of the population and number of households within the City. These new residents will require the same range of housing types and opportunities that exist within the City today, with greater provision of housing for first time home buyers and seniors. To accommodate this growth, a signification portion of the remaining vacant land within Richmond should be planned for residential use

Using SEMCOGs 2030 population projections and projections for number of persons per household, a determination can be made for the amount of acreage needed to support the number of dwelling units that will be needed. The projected population in 2030 is expected to increase by 2,785 persons, with the number of persons per household expected to decrease to 2.23. By dividing the projected household size into the projected population increase, the total number of dwelling units needed by 2030 is determined to be 1,249.

The effects that the population growth will have on Richmond are both positive and negative in nature. The City will receive increased tax provision from new residential units, but if densities are too low, the cost incurred by the City to provides services will be greater than the tax dollars generated. Residential growth will benefit existing businesses and may spur new commercial and industrial development. The *Richmond Business District Master Plan*, completed by the City in 1997 with assistance from McKenna Associates, and the *Economic Development Strategic Plan* completed by the Richmond Strategic Planning Committee in 1995, have noted that additional industrial and commercial growth will be supported by City and regional residential expansion. In light of the fact that both plans were completed before the 2000 census was conducted, the City of Richmond should consider updating both the *Business District Master Plan* and the *Economic Development Strategic Plan.*

Insert Map 12

The benefits of non-residential growth are significant. This growth is vital for the tax base of the City. Commercial and industrial uses (particularly the latter) are bargains in regards to the ratio of provision of SEV (State Equalized Value) to required services. Greater SEV provision from these uses would allow the City to rely less on residential uses and make it possible for the City to lower taxes. The benefits of new commercial and industrial uses would provide goods and services and employment to residents of the City and region.

However, all growth, particularly residential expansion, requires a greater provision of City services. The City′s Department of Public Works, including sewer and water services, and police and fire will have to be expanded to adequately facilitate the increased population. Enlargement of the Richmond School District facilities and provision of adequate City Hall and library facilities will also be required.

The growth in the City and in adjacent communities would generate additional vehicular traffic of residents and non-residents within the City. New growth, particularly in the non-traditional areas of the City and in adjacent communities, could also encourage additional auto-oriented uses on Gratiot Avenue and other applicable areas within and outside of the City. These new businesses could negatively impact Richmond′s downtown businesses. Sprawling commercial land uses has resulted in the demise of downtown business district across the state and the nation.

With these negative effects, Richmond risks losing its traditional character. This is an immense concern, as residents are drawn to the existing small-town feel of the City. Based on the vision session and survey, many current residents live in Richmond because of the City′s history, its tree-lined streets and its walk-ability. Loss of this character may encourage existing residents, some whom have lived in the community for many years, to leave (some residents indicated on the survey that they were moving away from the City within the next year for these same reasons).

Planned Development Policies

There are a number of significant natural features located in Richmond that the City would like to protect or preserve. Also, although not necessarily incompatible uses, there are uses that when located adjacent to each other have potential conflicts that can be mitigated by the proper design of the site. The purpose of planned developments as they are identified on the Future Land Use map is to ensure orderly planning and quality urban design that will be in harmony with existing and potential development in the surrounding neighborhood and to protect and preserve significant natural features of the land.

More specifically, the goals of planned development are to encourage innovation in land use, form of ownership and variety in design, layout, and type of structures constructed; to preserve significant natural features and open space; to promote efficient provision of public services and utilities; to minimize adverse traffic impacts; ensure compatibility of design between neighboring properties; to provide adequate housing and employment opportunities; and to encourage the development of recreational amenities.

Planned developments may be residential, commercial, industrial, or a combination of these types of development as determined by the land use designation on the Future Land Use Map. The City will encourage the use of planned development techniques for sites and buildings so designated on the Future Land Use Map. Each planned development area designated on the Future Land Use Map is essentially an overlay to the underlying designation. When development is proposed within one of these areas, if such development is not a planned development, the underlying land use designation should be adhered to.

Currently, the City does not have any regulations pertaining to Aplanned developments.@ It is recommended that the City adopt planned development regulations in order to meet the goals stated above. Also, the City should not move forward with any developments identified as planned development areas until such regulations have been provided.

Residential Policies

Residential provision within the Future Land Use Plan will strive to preserve the small-town and historic qualities of Richmond. The City will continue to encourage neighborhoods which promote walk-ability and a range of housing types, sizes and styles.

The City of Richmond will do its part to preserve farmland and open space in the region, with all future land use decisions taking this into account. Employment of programs available within the Farmland Preservation Act, transfer of development rights, cluster development and similar programs and tools may be employed and/or encouraged by the City for preservation. The City has employed and will continue to utilize annexation with individuals and P.A. 425 agreements with adjacent communities to contribute to this. Based on the areas discussed for boundary adjustment, significant areas of residential uses as well as areas for commercial and industrial uses could be provided for on land acquired through these agreements.

Residential development will occur in an orderly fashion, with new residential units constructed on existing vacant land within the City, followed by vacant areas directly adjacent to the City, and so forth. Cooperation with the Richmond School Board will be investigated for residential expansion to ensure that school facility needs are met.

Multiple family residential properties will continue to be found in a range of areas within the City. This will provide for the different needs of City residents, creating an efficient balance of the different residential categories. Multiple family residential also will be employed as a transitional use, buffering single-family residential from higher intensity commercial and industrial uses.

Planned development assists the City's attempts to protect and preserve its significant natural features. Also, although not necessarily incompatible uses, there are uses that when located adjacent to each other have potential conflicts that can be mitigated by the proper design of the site. The purpose of planned development is to ensure orderly planning and quality urban design that will be in harmony with existing and potential development in the surrounding neighborhood and to protect and preserve significant natural feature of the land.

More specifically, the goals of the planned single family residential district are designed to encourage innovation in land use, form of ownership and variety of design, layout and type of structures constructed; to preserve significant natural features and open space; to promote efficient provision of public services and utilities; to minimize adverse traffic impacts; ensure compatibility of design between neighboring properties; to provide adequate housing and employment opportunities; and to encourage the development of recreational amenities.

Based on these policies, the Future Land Use Plan has designated the following residential categories:

- **Single Family Residential**. Each of the following single family residential land use designations could be permitted to be developed within or without a planned development.

- *Low Density Single Family Residential.* This future land use designation will permit single family residential development at a density of two and one-half (2.5) to three (3) dwelling units per acre.

- *Medium Density Single Family Residential.* This future land use designation will permit single family residential development at a density of three and one-half (3.5) to four (4) units per acre.

- *High Density Single Family Residential*. This future land use designation will permit single family residential development at a density of five (5) to six (6) units per acre.

Single family residential uses will constitute the largest amount of both residential types and general uses throughout the entire City. Single-family residential uses are planned to incorporate approximately 680 acres, or 40.8% of total City land.

For new residential units, traditional-style homes on average-sized lots, with sidewalks, street trees and limited setbacks will be encouraged to promote the character that residents love and the City wishes to preserve. New developments will emulate the historic neighborhoods close to the downtown.

- **Multiple Family Residential**

Multiple family residential uses are projected to expand at a similar rate to all other residential uses throughout the City. These uses will constitute 135 acres, or 8% of land within the City.

This land use designation will permit the development of apartments, two-family residential dwellings, townhouses, and the like. This land use designation will help ensure an orderly transition in land use intensity. An increase in future multiple family residential areas is based on the need to provide proportionate affordable housing and senior housing opportunities for existing and new residents.

Additional two family residences could be created in other areas of the City, particularly with conversion of large single family residences that may go unused without such utilization. However, the character of the home and neighborhood must remain intact through unit conversion.

Future multiple family residential developments should be designed consistent with character of the neighborhood in which they are so located. Building should consist of high quality materials and design. Abundant landscaping, open space and pedestrian amenities are encouraged.

- **Mixed Residential**

Mixed Residential land uses are planned for 112.85 acres of land or 6.76% of the land within the City. This area is located south of 33 Mile Road to the Grand Trunk Railroad line and west to the City boundaries. This land use designation will permit the development of medium density single family residential uses as described above.
The City, however, recognizes that this area provides an important transition from the single family residential developments to the east and the low density residential developments in the adjacent

Township to the north and west. This area also contains significant natural features.

As an alternative to single family residential development, the City may consider other housing types in addition to single family residential dwelling units. The City may consider other housing types, that is two-family, townhouse, and senior housing, when proposed as a planned development. The additional housing types will only be permitted where such development preserves existing natural features, are arranged to be consistent with the surrounding neighborhoods and provide a transition in land use density. Additionally, future "mixed" residential developments must provide ample open space, landscaping and pedestrian amenities. This designation is not intended to permit the development of this area exclusively for two-family dwelling units, townhouse dwelling units, or senior housing units.

- **Mobile Homes**

The Future Land Use Plan has not designated additional land for mobile homes. Use of the existing mobile home park, Richmond Place, is planned to continue. Located at Beebe Street and Skinner Street north of Division Road, the mobile home park constitutes 16 acres, or 1% of total City land. No additional acreage has been dedicated to mobile homes based on the existing availability of mobile homes in the park and public comments. If additional mobile homes are needed in the future, the City must ensure that this housing is consistent with the character of Richmond. through site and home design guidelines, provided within the Zoning Ordinance.

Commercial/Office and Industrial Policies

The Future Land Use Plan will strive for adequate provision of commercial/office and industrial uses in adequate areas of the City. Additional uses will be encouraged within the City as based on the *Economic Development Strategic Plan* and resident comments. Growth of these non-residential uses will not come at the expense of the Asmall-town@, traditional character of the City.

In advocating this traditional character, commercial development will be encouraged principally within the Historic and Granary Business Districts. Facade and streetscape details will be provided as recommended within the *Business District Master Plan* and the Main Street Corridor Plan of this *Comprehensive Plan*. All development within these districts will capitalize upon the uniqueness of these business districts and preservation and reuse of existing buildings will occur. Creation of a Historic Commercial District will enable the City to focus on the structures and character of these districts and to make specific and applicable regulations.

Automobile-oriented uses will be reserved for the Muttonville area. The creation of the Highway Commercial District will allow the City to make specific guidelines which are applicable to these types of uses, and eliminate competition with the Downtown Business District. Provision of an additional district, Neighborhood Commercial, will provide for uses which are more transitional in nature between the Historic and Highway Districts.

Although each district will be unique, the districts will have a consistent theme linking the commercial uses. As recommended in the Corridor Plan, many of the traits found within the historic business districts, including traditional-style structures without large front setbacks, screened parking and sidewalks, will be reflected along Gratiot Avenue.

Additional acreage devoted specifically for office uses will be provided to allow for office developments of increased scale. The designation of office near the Lake Angela development will also serve as an appropriate transition from the high-intensity commercial uses fronting on Main Street to the single family homes.

Office uses will continue to be recommended within the downtown areas. Location of these uses will be permitted in the first and second floors of the downtown structures and in converted homes. Further conversion of these homes to office and commercial is encouraged to promote the linkage between the Historic and Granary Districts discussed in the Corridor Plan. Conversion of these homes must be completed by the following standards:

- Preservation of the home.
- Preservation of the character of the neighborhood.
- Lighting, signage and landscaping that reflects the residential appearance of the use and does not compromise existing residential properties in the neighborhood.

Residential units will also be permitted within the second floors of commercial and office buildings in the downtown areas. Adaptation and renovation of additional second floors for commercial or residential uses will continue to be encouraged.

The City will continue to be proactive in positioning itself for industrial development, as recommended in the *Economic Development Strategic Plan*. Significant acreage and services required for industrial uses will be provided. These uses will be permitted in the northeastern areas of the City (adjacent to Division Road and along the Grand Trunk Railroad) and are subject to adequate site and building design standards. This will ensure that facilities will not be detrimental to adjacent neighborhoods and will promote consistency with the character of the City.

Based on these policies, the Future Land Use Plan has designated the following commercial/office and industrial categories. Acreage of each category is included.

- **Historic Commercial**

  Historic Commercial uses can be found in the historic downtown areas of Richmond. These uses are projected to stretch along Main Street from Howard Street to Park Street and will constitute 30 acres, or 2% of total land within the City. The increase in the amount of historic commercial from the 1990 Master Plan (as based on the commercial properties located within the Historic and Granary

Commercial Districts) may appear small, but includes conversion of most non-commercial properties within the Howard Street to Park Street area to commercial (including home conversion). This increase will link the districts together (as discussed in the *Business District Master Plan*) and will provide additional commercial space to meet the population increases in Richmond and surrounding areas.

A designation of this area as a Historic District would serve many purposes. Historic Commercial uses are designed to serve the needs of residents within the neighborhood, throughout the City and for residents who live in surrounding townships or who are driving through the area. Traditionally, historic commercial resulted in first floor retail use and second and third floor residential use. As the historic downtown of Richmond, the Historic District would be designed to serve as a niche in providing the City with a distinct character, a residential base in the Downtown, and in drawing people from all over the region.

A Historic District should be created based on these facts. The designation should provide standards that promote preservation of the historic and traditional facades of structures, that promote buildings which cater to the street and sidewalk (zero front setbacks with use of rear or street parking) and which reflect the other recommendations of the Business District Plan and Main Street Analysis of this Plan. The District should discourage higher intensity commercial uses that are permitted within the Highway Commercial District.

- **Neighborhood Commercial**

Neighborhood Commercial has been designated for commercial areas found along Division Road as well as at the southwest corner of the 33 Mile Road and Main Street intersection. Neighborhood Commercial is planned for approximately 21 acres of land within the City.

This land use designation is intended to provide additional commercial areas within the City to meet the day to day service needs of the residents. Future land uses within these areas may consist of a drug store, laundry mat, convenience store, or other similar retail or service establishment. Large scale Abig box@ retail establishments or automobile oriented establishments should be prohibited within these areas.

Future development of these areas should be consistent with the established Asmall town@ character of the City.

- **Highway Commercial**

The Highway Commercial will permit higher intensity commercial uses which are not permitted in the aforementioned commercial districts. Because of this difference in intensity of use more land area is provided for the Highway Commercial land use.

Approximately 206 acres of land have been planned for future Highway Commercial land uses. These land uses will cater to automobile oriented development.

The Highway Commercial designation is intended to provide a number of goods and services for residents of Richmond and outlying areas. However, it is vital that these areas complement the

Historic District and established character of the City. Competition between the districts and expansion of highway commercial uses north on Main Street and west of Lake Angela Estates could have detrimental effects on the City, its businesses and character. Standards must be provided in the Ordinance which discourage both of these threats.

- **Office**

Office uses serve as an appropriate transition between residential uses and industrial and higher intensity commercial uses. Office is essentially a low-intensity commercial use. Many of the incompatibilities found between commercial and residential uses are not an issue as most office uses close in the evening and do not produce the higher amounts of traffic found in a typical commercial use. To promote this transition, office uses have been planned for an area between the Highway Commercial uses and the single-family residential uses found in Lake Angela Estates. An additional area has been planned for office along Stoecker Street to reflect the trend of office at this location. In total, 22 acres have been planned for future office use. The decrease in land within the Office District was intentional. Many existing office use designations have been converted to commercial in order to promote consistency within the downtown. Additional office uses will continually be encouraged within the Business District of the City because of the compatibility of commercial and office uses.

- **Industrial**

Industrial uses have been planned for approximately 134 acres of the City. These areas will provide employment and support to the tax base. The additional acreage is based on the available parcels appropriate for industrial use within the City.

The expansion of industrial uses will occur in areas north of Division Road, particularly with new industrial land use on a large parcel north of an existing industrial area off of Skinner Road and industrial use on the parcel annexed into the City from Columbus Township. These are the most appropriate locations for industrial use within the City. Industrial uses in locations that are not appropriate, including the large parcel north of Division Road across from the high school and the industrial usage of the grain elevator, will be prohibited in the future to promote the transition occurring in each area.

Future industrial developments must be designed to complement the existing area, provide adequate setbacks, screening and landscaping, limit and screen outdoor storage areas, and have building of a high quality appearance.

- **Public / Semi-Public Policies**

Land reserved for public/semi-public uses includes park provisions and provision of land for expansion or construction of government facilities.

Additional land may become necessary for City Hall and the library based on the facility needs study currently being completed by the City. The investigation has determined that the City has two options: City Hall can be expanded into the adjacent laundromat or will have to be moved to a

different location in the City. The alternative that is employed will most likely be enacted within the next few years.

Parks and recreation needs are currently being met in most categories and areas of the City. Additional park space will be provided in the northern and western sections of Richmond and in areas of future expansion. Additional facilities and upgrades should be provided where applicable based on the recommendations of the *Parks and Recreation Plan*.

The Future Land Use map also includes the conversion of the abandoned Grand Trunk Railroad to a pedestrian trail. The City will investigate the best methods to link the trail to its surrounding areas, particularly the downtown area. These methods will include signage, benches, crosswalks and such.

- **Circulation Policies**

Methods of eliminating transportation deficiencies have and will continue to be investigated within Richmond. The City will utilize the recommendations of the *Master Thoroughfare Plan*, the *Business District Plan* and recommendations of this Comprehensive Master Plan.

The Corridor Plan discussed the existing traffic concerns along Main Street. The City was encouraged to continue working with MDOT (the Michigan Department of Transportation) toward signalization, intersection closings and other improvements which would benefit the street and the City.

The creation of an alternate truck route will continue to be investigated. The use of alternative routes has many benefits but is a potential hazard to the success of Richmond′s downtown businesses. An alternate route, if not properly executed, could be used by passenger vehicles which typically stop and frequent businesses within the downtown. Adequate measures must be taken to ensure that the downtown is not negatively affected by the alternate route. Signing that directs trucks to the alternate route and directs passenger vehicles to continue to Main Street must be employed. Any alternate route should be planned as a scenic corridor without commercial uses so that the existing commercial centers are not negatively affected.

The disapproval of additional traffic signalization and pedestrian crossing bubbles along Main Street should not discourage further attempts. The City will continue to work with MDOT for improvements, as increased traffic volumes due to population growth in the City and region may warrant signals at highly-traveled intersections.

Future developments will be encouraged to limit the number of access drives onto City roads and streets and should be encouraged (or required, if so warranted by the Zoning Ordinance) to share driveways. This is of particular concern on Gratiot Avenue, with the amount of developable land and with the automobile-oriented commercial properties that are planned for this area.

ZONING PLAN

Zoning continues as one of the basic tools available for the purpose of regulating and guiding development. To achieve future development goals, it is essential that zoning be applied in an orderly manner, consistent with the basic guidelines of the Future Lane Use Plan. The accompanying table summarizes which Zoning Classifications correlate with the different Future Land Use Classes.

FUTURE LAND USE AND ZONING SUMMARY

FUTURE LAND USE CLASSIFICATION	ZONING CLASSIFCATION EQUIVALENT
Low Density Single Family Residential	R-1 (Single Family Residential)
Medium Density Single Family Residential	R-2 (Single Family Residential)
High Density Single Family Residential	R-3 (Single Family Residential)
Planned Single Family Residential	R-1, R-2, and R-3
Multiple Family Residential	R-T (Two Family Residential) RM-1 (Multiple Family Residential)
Planned Multiple Family Residential	R-T and RM-1
Mixed Residential	R-1, R-2, R-3, R-T, RM-1, O, and B-1
Mobile Home	R-4 (Manufactured Housing Park)
Historic Commercial	B-2 (Downtown Business)
Neighborhood Commercial	B-1 (Local Business)
Highway Commercial	B-3 (General Business)
Office	O (Office)
Industrial	I-1 (Limited Industrial) I-2 (General Industrial)
Publi/Semi-Public	PSP (Public/Semi-Public Services)

Insert Map 13
ZONING MAP

IMPLEMENTATION

Implementation strategies are a key component of the success of the Master Plan. Strategies determine how the guidelines and recommendations of the Plan are enacted. However, the Master Plan should never be viewed as a finished product. Various adjustments or additions may become necessary as events or needs of Richmond demand. Although the major goals and objectives should not be altered, other aspects will require periodic alterations as the Plan is implemented and as circumstances change in the city, region, state and nation. This will assure the best interests of the residents and businesses of the City.

Zoning

Zoning is the division of a community into districts for the purpose of regulating the use of land and buildings, their height and bulk, the proportion of the lot that may be covered by them, and the density of development. Zoning is enacted under the police power of the State for the purpose of promoting health, safety and general welfare and has long been supported constitutionally by the U.S. Supreme Court and the Michigan courts.

The purpose of zoning is to assist in orderly development and growth. It is also used to protect property values and investments. Because of the impact it can have on the use of land and related services, zoning must be related to the Master Plan. Zoning is an instrument for effecting that part of the Plan relating to the use and development of land. Through the process of site plan review, special approval of certain land uses and administration, the City implements its zoning in conformance with the Plan.

Although the Future Land Use map is not a zoning map, it will be used as a guide to Zoning Ordinance changes. The key to Plan implementation is the timing of the zoning map changes, as initiated by the Planning Commission or by petitioners.

An annual appraisal of the zoning map should be prepared. The generally accepted practice for zoning provision is based on a five-year projection. The review should ensure that environmental, land use, circulation and all other proposals of this plan are reflected in the ordinance, particularly under site plan review and special land use approval standards. The map′s proposals should be viewed as flexible, but the overall theme of each designation should be preserved.

Creation of the Historic, Neighborhood and Highway Commercial Districts and the Agricultural/Vacant District is one method of zoning implementation Richmond should investigate. The new commercial districts would incorporate and adjust the standards of the B-1 and B-2 Districts based on the standards and recommendations found within the Master Plan, the *Business District Master Plan* and similar.

Review and adjustment of existing districts should also occur. Examples of standards from this Plan that should be incorporated into districts include specific residential development standards, such as adjusting house setbacks within residential districts to emulate the setbacks found within the City′s historic residential neighborhoods, and conversion standards for single family residential to office or two-family uses.

Rezoning of parcels to these and other appropriate districts should occur according to the Future Land Use plan. Rezoning to the Agricultural/Vacant District should not be seen as permanent. The designation is pertinent to the structured building pattern and will require rezoning to a new district upon buildout of applicable parcels.

Inclusion of new parcels into the City through PA 425 agreements or annexation will require zoning designation. Agricultural/Vacant designation should be considered for all new parcels and used when appropriate.

Capital Improvement Program

To evaluate, prioritize and structure financing of public improvement projects, the City should draft and annually update a capital improvement program. Such a program provides a basis for systematic Planning Commission review of proposed improvements related to the Master Plan and creates an opportunity to coordinate timing, location and financing of those projects. To that end, three objectives can be achieved: (1) financial analysis can minimize the impact of improvement projects on the local tax rate; (2) project scheduling can occur, given an advance picture of future need and development activities; and (3) the Planning Commission can demonstrate its coordinating role in serving other elements of local government in formulating project recommendations.

Capital improvement programs are most often presented in terms of specific calendar or fiscal year listings, although there are some shown in terms of priority categories with a more flexible time schedule. Six-year programs are the most common period.

Generally, the capital improvement process includes the following steps:

- Inventory of potential projects as related to the Master Plan, including preliminary cost estimation and initial prioritization.
- Evaluation of projects proposed, in addition to those in the Plan, by various sponsors and City departments.
- Financial analysis of the proposed projects in terms of the available versus required community revenues.
- Project scheduling for six years.
- Recommendation of first-year projects to City Council.
- Formal approval of the capital improvement budget.

Because capital improvement programming is fundamental political policy, the City Council should establish spending levels and select the improvement projects for implementation. The role of the Planning Commission is primarily to coordinate material submitted by others and to work with financial officials in assembling facts for decision by the City Council, after a review and recommendation based on this Plan.

Capital improvement programming could be used within Richmond for many improvements. Streetscape improvements, facility and infrastructure construction or renovation, and similar could be included as part of a capital improvement program for the City.

Liaison

Any coordinated planning program requires good liaison between the Planning Commission, the City Council and other City boards, the School Board, citizen committees, etc. Recommendations by the Commission to the City Council could aid in selection of sites or facilities for expansion, could help to prepare a program for rehabilitating specific districts, and could assist in decreasing the cost of development by spelling out in advance the needs and location of various functions, thereby avoiding duplication in expenditures.

Public Understanding and Support

The necessity of citizen participation and understanding of the planning process and the Plan cannot be over-emphasized. A carefully organized public education program is needed to organize and identify public support for any community development plan. The lack of citizen understanding and support can seriously limit implementation of the planning proposals. The failure to support needed bond issues, failure to elect progressive officials, and litigation concerning taxation, special assessments, zoning, and public improvements are some of the results of public misunderstanding of long-range plans.

In order to organize public support most effectively, the City must emphasize the reasons for the planning program and encourage citizen participation in the adoption of the Plan and the continued planning process. Public education can be achieved through an informational program involving talks, newspaper articles, and preparation of simple summary statements on plans for distribution. Participation by residents in various civic groups is evidence of community involvement.
Periodic community opinion surveys should be considered as another means by which the City government can gauge changing attitudes and priorities.

Funding

Successful implementation of these projects will depend on the ability of the City to secure the necessary financing. Besides the general fund, there are several sources of revenues which the City could utilize and should investigate in more detail. The primary sources of funding are summarized below:

Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA)

- Home Improvement Program. This program provides low interest loans for home improvements through local lending institutions. The Home Improvement Program (HIP) is not targeted to any specific area, but can be utilized city-wide. Interest rates on loans are related to income. The property must be twenty years or older in age or in need of repair: to correct items that are hazardous to health and safety; or for items related to energy conservation.
- Neighborhood Improvement Program. The Neighborhood Improvement Program (NIP) is another home improvement program developed by MSHDA, but it is directed toward specific revitalization areas. Loans, with interest rates dependent on income, are made available to homeowners within such areas. The program operates very similarly to the HIP with local lending institutions participating in the program.

Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG)
The Community Development Block Grant program is an annual allocation of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to local governments for wide range of community development activities, including housing rehabilitation, public and neighborhood improvements and economic development activities which primarily benefit low and moderate income persons. The City receives funds through Macomb County.

Downtown Development Authority (DDA), P.A. 197 of 1975
A Downtown Development Authority (DDA) is a non-profit development corporation within the business district of the City which exists for the purpose of promoting a desirable environment for businesses and residents and implementing economic revitalization projects. Projects can be implemented by the DDA through a variety of financing techniques, including bond issues, tax increment financing, and public and private contributions.

Local Development Finance Authority (LDFA), P.A. 281 of 1986
Act 281 is the primary means of making tax increment financing procedures available to assist industrial development. The LDFA Act is targeted toward individual eligible properties, rather than toward a development district. The City could establish an LDFA board which would then have the power to plan, build public facilities, acquire land, clear and redevelop land along with other development powers.

Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA)
In 1991, this program was established to fund enhancements to non-motorized transportation facilities, transportation aesthetics, mitigation of water pollution due to highway runoff and transportation related historic preservation.

Michigan Bureau of History
Historic Preservation grants are available through the Michigan Bureau of History under the Department of State. These federal funds are received from the National Park Service and administered by the Department of State. Grant funds can be used to inventory historic and archaeological sites, nominate eligible sites to the National Register of Historic Places, plan for the preservation of historic sites, and produce educational programs to promote the historic preservation program. A limited portion of the funds can be used for plans and specifications for properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places, but funds cannot be used to restore historic properties.

Intergovernmental Cooperation
The Boundary Adjustment section of this Master Plan discussed the opportunities of Public Act 425 of 1984 and annexation. The City has and should continue to investigate methods of such cooperation with the adjacent townships to promote a system of growth and to preserve agricultural and open space in the region. The City and these communities should regularly communicate and share plans to maximize the benefits for their citizens.

Rehabilitation Act
Act 344 of the Public Acts of 1945 is the basic Michigan rehabilitation statute. It provides powers and procedures for local governments to acquire, assemble, and finance the redevelopment of blighted areas for general rehabilitation purposes.

HUD Section 202/8
This is a federally sponsored program which provides mortgage financing and rent subsidies for the construction and maintenance of elderly housing. Only non-profit, private organizations (such as churches, unions, fraternal and other non-profit organizations) are eligible sponsors, but local governments usually cooperate in the assembly of land, applications, public improvements and supportive actions. Such projects are tax exempt, but the State rebates an equivalent amount to local tax jurisdictions.

Special Assessment
This technique allows for the financing of public improvements, such as roads or street lights, through the assessing of property taxes, on an equitable basis, to the benefitted property owners in a specific district.

Michigan Natural Resources Trust Fund
This fund replaced the Michigan Land Trust Fund in October, 1985. All proposals for local grants must include a local match of at least 25 percent of total project cost. Projects eligible for funding include: acquisition of land or rights in land for recreational uses or for protection of the land for environmental importance or scenic beauty; and development proposals for public outdoor recreation or resource protection purposes (i.e., picnic areas, beaches, boating access, fishing and hunting facilities, winter sports areas, playgrounds, ballfields, tennis courts, and trails, etc.). Indoor facilities are considered only if their primary purpose is to support outdoor recreation. Examples include nature interpretive buildings and park visitor centers. Outdoor recreation support buildings such as restrooms and storage buildings, are also eligible. Proposed local government fund recipients must have a recreation plan no more than five years old and approved by the Department of Natural Resources.

Fund recipients have specific obligations following project completion. These include properly operating and maintaining properties and facilities, and keeping them available for use by all members of the public.

Shared Credit Rating Program - Michigan Municipal Bond Authority (MMBA)
This program created under Act 227 of 1985 offers municipalities the opportunity to take advantage of the State's improved credit rating. Because the MMBA is authorized to issue bonds to make loans to Michigan municipalities through the purchase of municipal obligations, the Authority allows municipalities to borrow funds for their capital and operating needs without going to the expense or trouble of entering the bond market on their own. Many small communities are at a disadvantage when issuing debt in the bond market because they frequently have no bond ratings and potential investors know little about their finances or economy. In addition, some communities tend to borrow infrequently, in small amounts. Because such debt issues are not particularly attractive to the financial markets, borrowing costs for such communities can be high.

The Authority sells tax-exempt bonds in the national municipal bond market. Proceeds from the sale are used to make loans to eligible Michigan communities by purchasing their bonds. In essence, the MMBA "bundles" smaller local debt issues into a larger, more attractive bond issue and then offers it to the national market. By consolidating numerous local bond issues, local units will save on printing costs, rating agency fees, and credit enhancements. As participating communities make principal and interest payments to the Authority to repay their debt, the Authority uses these payments to repay the Authority's bond.

Continuous Planning

A role of the Planning Commission is to provide recommendations to the City Council and administration. This planning function is a continuous process which does not terminate with the completion of the Plan. Urban areas are in constant change and planning is an on-going process of identification, adjustment, and resolution of the problems. In order to sustain the planning process and generate positive results, maintain momentum, and respond to change, the Plan should be reviewed and updated periodically.

COMMUNITY PLANNING CONSULTANT

McKenna Associates, Incorporated
Community Planning Urban Design
235 East Main Street, Suite 105
Northville, Michigan 48167

Phillip C. McKenna, AICP, PCP..... President
Amy T. Neary ..... Project Manager
Peter K. Squires..... Project Manager
Scott S. Lee, AICP ..... Project Planner
George Peek, AICP, PCP ..... Project Consultant
Jason King..... Project Assistant
Sabah Aboody-Keer ..... GIS Coordinator
Kacy Smith..... Text Production