



Fresh Coast Planning

950 Taylor Avenue, Ste 200
Grand Haven, MI 49417
www.freshcoastplanning.com

Gregory L. Ransford, MPA
616-638-1240
greg@freshcoastplanning.com

Julie Lovelace
616-914-0922
julie@freshcoastplanning.com

Sara Moring-Hilt
586-850-8784
sara@freshcoastplanning.com

Kevin Yeomans
616-821-4969
kevin@freshcoastplanning.com

MEMORANDUM

To: Robinson Township Planning Commission
From: Gregory L. Ransford
Date: July 22, 2022
Re: Revisions to Chapter Eight, Chapter Nine, Chapter 10 / Newly Drafted Appendix

Pursuant to your direction at your June 14, 2022 meeting, attached is a revised draft of Chapter Eight – Public Utilities, Chapter Nine – Transportation, and Chapter Ten – Implementation.

As you will recall, you directed us to perform the following:

Chapter Eight – Public Utilities

- Introduction - add exception for Lake Michigan Drive Overlay, last sentence of the first paragraph
- Review language throughout to add “high density residential” in the northwest area so it is intentionally redundant
- Recommendation 2 and Strategy 2 – add Lake Michigan Drive to Primary Growth Area to match name to classification
- Relocate the questions into a table

While not directed by the Planning Commission, during our update of the Introduction we also performed capitalization revisions regarding the Primary Growth Area language therein.

Chapter Nine – Transportation

- Table
 - Add M-231 at 65 miles per hour
 - Clean-up table where words touch
 - Eliminate (a)(b)(c) and clean up the organization as a result
- Mercury Drive – separate “entirelength” into two words
- Change “multimodel” to “multimodal”
- Principal Arterials – revise depending on response from the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) regarding their categorization

We have performed these revisions accordingly and believe the changes to the chapters achieve your direction

In regards to the MDOT response, we unfortunately continue to wait for their reply. After several communications to Cam Litco at MDOT, we connected on July 13th and were informed that he would need to contact higher level transportation planners within MDOT to provide us with the information we are seeking. As of the date of this memorandum, we have not yet received a response.

Chapter Ten – Implementation

As you know, the first version of this Chapter was incomplete because we sought guidance from the Planning Commission. You provided us direction regarding table structure therein and we believe the attached achieves that direction. It is important to note that as a result of

the need to copy and paste from existing documents that were converted from PDF to Word format, the draft chapter is rough in appearance. Once finalized, we will “clean-up” the document so it matches the remainder of the Master Plan.

As always, additions are shown in bold text and deletions are shown in strikethrough text from the previous versions of the Chapters. Also attached are clean copies of the chapters.

Appendix

Additionally attached is the draft Appendix, which consolidates all of the current Master Plan statistical data to the extent practicable and provides for the organization of community mapping as well as the M-231 Growth Areas factors, tables, and maps.

In that regard, it is important to highlight Table 2 of the M-231 Growth Area and whether the Planning Commission believes it is appropriate to update the traffic data therein. Finally, it is important to note that the available Census data is limited to the 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimate, which is completed by the United States Census Bureau. The reason this data was used is because the 2020 Census data release date has been pushed to the year 2023. The Planning Commission will need to consider whether to move forward with this data or wait until next year to complete the Master Plan process. It is important to note that this is the second delay of the data and as a result, we are not confident it will be available in the year 2023.

You will note that the maps within the Appendix are not provided. The Ottawa County Geographic Information Systems Department is working to create those maps from the available files. Once they are available, we will provide them to you.

Finally, all of the draft Appendix is new, with the exception of those items highlighted in yellow from the current M-231 Subarea Plan. Given this, we do not have the usual clean and edit copies attached.

Planning Commission Considerations

As a result of reaching the end of the process related to the text of the Master Plan, we wanted to highlight existing Subarea Plan pages for your consideration for inclusion within the document, if necessary. That is, while we believe this language has generally been included throughout the document where needed, or satisfied by Zoning Ordinance amendment, we nonetheless wanted to make sure you were satisfied with the draft language related to these pages. They include page 46 and page 47, as well as the tables on Page 48. For your convenience, we have attached those pages for your review.

In addition and aforementioned, the Planning Commission may desire to review the following within the Appendix:

- Table 2 traffic data
- The available Census data

We will be prepared to discuss the aforementioned items further at your August 9, 2022 meeting. If you have any questions, please let us know.

GLR
Principal Planner

Attachments

cc: Frank Johnson, Supervisor

Chapter Eight

Public Utilities

Introduction

While several public water and sanitary sewer systems are available to serve the Township, the locations of these systems do not necessarily align with intended land use development. While the Township does not operate its own system, limited service to property owners exists on systems that are operated by neighboring entities. During the planning period, the Township does not seek to own and operate any system. The current Water Supply System Master Plan identifies a need to expand water service in the High Density Residential Classification of this Master Plan within the northwest area of the Township due to groundwater issues. This Plan does not intend to promote public water service outside of that area, **except within the Primary Growth Area of the M-231 Highway.**

M-231 Highway

The ability to provide utilities affects the development potential of land. Development sites within the ~~P~~primary ~~G~~rowth ~~A~~rea are not suited for larger scale on-site septic system treatment of sewer wastewater because of poorly drained soils, a high groundwater table and the higher potential for environmental contamination. While sewer system extensions are recommended for the ~~P~~primary ~~G~~rowth ~~A~~reas, Township officials recognize the potential conflict between sewer service in the ~~P~~primary ~~G~~rowth ~~A~~rea and pressure to further extend sewer lines into valued agricultural and rural areas. Only utility extensions to locations best suited for development and consistent with the managed growth intent of the growth boundary should be supported. Therefore, the primary growth area, which is also the utility service area, shall mark the separation between rural and commercial/industrial areas.

Sewer extensions from adjacent townships should only be sized to accommodate the ~~P~~primary ~~G~~rowth ~~A~~rea in addition to a reasonable amount of extra capacity, should boundaries be re-evaluated in the future. Additionally, decisions concerning sewer options should consider cost, distance, capacity and land use. There are three potential options to provide sewer to the ~~P~~primary ~~G~~rowth ~~A~~rea each with various capacities to serve future development:

- West Central Ottawa County Wastewater Treatment Plant
- Grand Haven-Spring Lake
- Allendale Township

Acknowledging that on-site septic system treatment is not the desired long-term solution to sewer water treatment, when approving Special Land Uses within the Primary Growth Area under the future overlay district requirements, landowners shall agree to a Special Assessment Agreement. This agreement will be a precursor to a future special assessment district that will fund construction of the sewer system, as sewer infrastructure may not be feasible or cost-effective prior to a critical mass of development. As properties develop and construct on-site septic system

treatment facilities, systems shall be built to be expandable and ultimately convertible to connect to a public system.

Related, respondents to the Master Plan Update Community Survey were asked the following:

- ~~Should the Township require developers to provide public water in order to support development? (Q1)~~
- ~~Are you willing to pay for the extension of public water to facilitate commercial development? (Q2)~~
- ~~Are you willing to pay for the extension of public water to facilitate industrial development? (Q3)~~
- ~~Are you willing to pay for the extension of public water to facilitate residential development? (Q4)~~
- ~~Are you willing to pay for the extension of public sewer to facilitate residential development? (Q5)~~
- ~~Are you willing to incur an increase in taxes to pay for public water if it meant better quality water for existing residences? (Q6)~~

~~Below are their responses.~~

	Yes	No
Should the Township require developers to provide public water in order to support development?	60%	21%
Are you willing to pay for the extension of public water to facilitate commercial development?	17%	70%
Are you willing to pay for the extension of public water to facilitate industrial development?	9%	81%
Are you willing to pay for the extension of public water to facilitate residential development?	27%	60%
Are you willing to pay for the extension of public sewer to facilitate residential development?	22%	64%
Are you willing to incur an increase in taxes to pay for public water if it meant better quality water for existing residences?	28%	57%

As a result of public workshops, the Master Plan Update Community Survey, and various planning meetings we have concluded that the following goals are paramount for public utilities within Robinson Township. In addition, through the use of modern planning principles, where applicable, recommendations regarding these goals as well as strategies to achieve success are provided below.

Goals, Recommendations, and Strategies

Goals

- Concentrate public utility extensions to avoid sprawl and to protect farmland

Recommendations

- Prohibit the extension of public water utilities outside of the High Density Residential Classification within the northwest area of the Township for the purpose of plats, condominiums, Planned Unit Developments, Open Space Developments, and similar developments
- Limit the extension of public sanitary sewer utilities to the **Lake Michigan Drive Primary Growth Area** only

Strategies

- Prohibit the extension of public water utilities outside of the High Density Residential Classification within the northwest area of the Township for the purpose of plats, condominiums, Planned Unit Developments, Open Space Developments, and similar developments
- Limit the extension of public sanitary sewer utilities to the **Lake Michigan Drive Primary Growth Area** only

Chapter Eight

Public Utilities

Introduction

While several public water and sanitary sewer systems are available to serve the Township, the locations of these systems do not necessarily align with intended land use development. While the Township does not operate its own system, limited service to property owners exists on systems that are operated by neighboring entities. During the planning period, the Township does not seek to own and operate any system. The current Water Supply System Master Plan identifies a need to expand water service in the High Density Residential Classification of this Master Plan within the northwest area of the Township due to groundwater issues. This Plan does not intend to promote public water service outside of that area, except within the Primary Growth Area of the M-231 Highway.

M-231 Highway

The ability to provide utilities affects the development potential of land. Development sites within the Primary Growth Area are not suited for larger scale on-site septic system treatment of sewer wastewater because of poorly drained soils, a high groundwater table and the higher potential for environmental contamination. While sewer system extensions are recommended for the Primary Growth Area, Township officials recognize the potential conflict between sewer service in the Primary Growth Area and pressure to further extend sewer lines into valued agricultural and rural areas. Only utility extensions to locations best suited for development and consistent with the managed growth intent of the growth boundary should be supported. Therefore, the primary growth area, which is also the utility service area, shall mark the separation between rural and commercial/industrial areas.

Sewer extensions from adjacent townships should only be sized to accommodate the Primary Growth Area in addition to a reasonable amount of extra capacity, should boundaries be re-evaluated in the future. Additionally, decisions concerning sewer options should consider cost, distance, capacity and land use. There are three potential options to provide sewer to the Primary Growth Area each with various capacities to serve future development:

- West Central Ottawa County Wastewater Treatment Plant
- Grand Haven-Spring Lake
- Allendale Township

Acknowledging that on-site septic system treatment is not the desired long-term solution to sewer water treatment, when approving Special Land Uses within the Primary Growth Area under the future overlay district requirements, landowners shall agree to a Special Assessment Agreement. This agreement will be a precursor to a future special assessment district that will fund construction of the sewer system, as sewer infrastructure may not be feasible or cost-effective prior to a critical mass of development. As properties develop and construct on-site septic system

treatment facilities, systems shall be built to be expandable and ultimately convertible to connect to a public system.

Related, respondents to the Master Plan Update Community Survey were asked the following:

	Yes	No
Should the Township require developers to provide public water in order to support development?	60%	21%
Are you willing to pay for the extension of public water to facilitate commercial development?	17%	70%
Are you willing to pay for the extension of public water to facilitate industrial development?	9%	81%
Are you willing to pay for the extension of public water to facilitate residential development?	27%	60%
Are you willing to pay for the extension of public sewer to facilitate residential development?	22%	64%
Are you willing to incur an increase in taxes to pay for public water if it meant better quality water for existing residences?	28%	57%

As a result of public workshops, the Master Plan Update Community Survey, and various planning meetings we have concluded that the following goals are paramount for public utilities within Robinson Township. In addition, through the use of modern planning principles, where applicable, recommendations regarding these goals as well as strategies to achieve success are provided below.

Goals, Recommendations, and Strategies

Goals

- Concentrate public utility extensions to avoid sprawl and to protect farmland

Recommendations

- Prohibit the extension of public water utilities outside of the High Density Residential Classification within the northwest area of the Township for the purpose of plats, condominiums, Planned Unit Developments, Open Space Developments, and similar developments
- Limit the extension of public sanitary sewer utilities to the Lake Michigan Drive Primary Growth Area only

Strategies

- Prohibit the extension of public water utilities outside of the High Density Residential Classification within the northwest area of the Township for the purpose of plats, condominiums, Planned Unit Developments, Open Space Developments, and similar developments
- Limit the extension of public sanitary sewer utilities to the Lake Michigan Drive Primary Growth Area only

Chapter Nine

Transportation

Introduction

Yellow highlights pending MDOT

Roadway function, efficiency and safety in Robinson Township can be furthered by defining a roadway classification system and planning and designing these facilities for their specific purpose. A functional system or hierarchy of roads provides for movement of traffic as well as access to specific sites. This hierarchy will range from principal arterials such as Lake Michigan Drive **and the M-231 Highway**, which primarily serves cross-county movement, to local subdivision streets that provide access to individual homes. This system defines the roles of each street, in terms of operational requirements; which is translated into planning, management and physical design features.

Principal Arterial

The Lake Michigan Drive corridor **and M-231 Highway are** ~~is~~ major roadways through the heart of Ottawa County and serves a vital function toward connecting Robinson Township with developed areas in Grand Haven Charter Township, Allendale Charter Township and further east to the City of Grand Rapids and Kent County in general.

Collectors

The collectors serve to funnel traffic from local subdivision streets in residential neighborhoods to the arterials. Collectors also afford access to abutting properties. Many individual subdivisions contain one or more collector streets that carry traffic from the local streets and connect with adjacent neighborhoods.

Local and Private Streets

These interior streets provide access to abutting property and homes. These roadways are generally short and discontinuous and only provide connection to one or two collector streets.

Based upon the current view of the Township, the following is believed to be an adequate description of existing roads and highways:

TYPE	FUNCTION	SPEED	FEATURES
State Highway*	Thoroughfare through the Township.	55 to 65 mph.	Higher traffic volumes with generally wider right of ways.

Arterial**	Connects areas of the Township or a thoroughfare through the Township	55 mph.	Higher traffic volumes, sometimes wider right of ways.
Secondary	Provide connecting link between arterials and represent the location of most residences.	55 mph.	Moderate traffic, almost exclusively 66 feet right of way.
Private Street (serving more than 4 dwellings), typically paved.	Provide access to individual properties.	Unregulated by the County	Should be designed to discourage through traffic, 66 feet ROW for possible public dedication at a later date.
Private Street (serving 4 or fewer dwellings)	Provide access to a limited number of individual properties.	Unregulated by the County, however, length and condition limit speed.	Should be designed to discourage through traffic, 66 feet ROW for possible public dedication at a later date.

(a) State Highway (East/West)

- i. ~~M-45 (Lake Michigan Drive) from 144th Avenue to 96th Avenue~~
- ii. ~~M-231 from the Grand River to Lake Michigan Drive~~

*State Highway

- M-45 (Lake Michigan Drive) from 144th Avenue to 96th Avenue
- M-231 from the Grand River to Lake Michigan Drive

**Arterial Streets

- 144th Avenue from M-45 to Green Street
- 128th Avenue from M-45 to Green Street
- 120th Avenue-- entire length of Township
- 104th Avenue -- M-45 to North Cedar Street
- 96th Avenue -- Fillmore Street to M-45
- Lincoln, 112th Avenue, Osborn, Bass Drive -- entire length
- Mercury Drive, Green Street, North Cedar Street—entire length
- Fillmore Street-- entire length.

(b) North/South Arterial Streets

- i. ~~144th Avenue from M 45 to Green Street~~
- ii. ~~128th Avenue from M 45 to Green Street~~
- iii. ~~120th Avenue entire length of Township~~
- iv. ~~104th Avenue M 45 to North Cedar Street~~
- v. ~~96th Avenue Fillmore Street to M 45~~

(c) East/West Arterial Streets

- i. ~~Lincoln, 112th Avenue, Osborn, Bass Drive entire length~~
- ii. ~~Mercury Drive, Green Street, North Cedar Street entire length~~
- iii. ~~Fillmore Street entire length~~

Overall, eighty-six percent (86%) of respondents to the Master Plan Update Community Survey indicated that the ease of travel between destinations within the Township was “excellent” or “good.” Approximately seventy percent (70%) of respondents indicated that planning for future road congestion was “important” or “very important.”

Pedestrians

Coupled with vehicle transportation, providing for pedestrian friendly means of travel are important to achieve complete streets within the Township.

Approximately seventy percent (70%) of respondents to the Master Plan Update Community Survey indicated that multi-use pathways for pedestrians, bicycles, and or equestrians are appropriate when adjacent to agriculture within the Township. Slightly over fifty percent (50%) of respondents indicated that adding bike lanes and paved shoulders along roads were “important” or “very important,” coupled with approximately twenty-four percent (24%) indicating that those were “somewhat important.”

As a result of public workshops, the Master Plan Update Community Survey, and various planning meetings we have concluded that the following goals are paramount for transportation within Robinson Township. In addition, through the use of modern planning principles, where applicable, recommendations regarding these goals as well as strategies to achieve success are provided below.

Goals, Recommendations, and Strategies

Goals

- Access points for traffic on Lake Michigan Drive should not be restricted by excessive driveway aprons
- An emphasis on interconnected drives and streets should be promoted so that internal trips can be made without compelling drivers to enter and exit the main road multiple

- times
- A system of integrated shared use paths should be promoted for all new developments to provide safe walking routes to surrounding uses

Recommendations

- Interconnect service drives to improve traffic distribution and to promote access management
- Minimize traffic disruptions on arterials, while keeping through traffic off of the local residential streets
- Promote a ~~multi-model~~ multimodal transportation system, encompassing bicycles, pedestrian, and automobile traffic

Strategies

- Require the layout of new residential developments to be extensions of existing neighborhoods, where possible. This should apply to roadway extensions and pedestrian pathways, to ensure interconnected neighborhoods.
- Consider adopting access management regulations, shared driveway regulations, and pedestrian pathway requirements within the Zoning Ordinance for all commercial and industrial uses

Complete Streets Plan

In 2010, the Michigan Planning Enabling Act was amended to require that Master Plans account for “all legal users” of the transportation system within the municipality. The amended Act, in part, states that the Master Plan must include, “among other things, promotion of or adequate provision for 1 or more of the following: (i) A system of transportation to lessen congestion on streets and provide for safe and efficient movement of people and goods by motor vehicles, bicycles, pedestrians, and other legal users.” MCL 125.3807(2)(d).

This Chapter of the Robinson Township Master Plan, Chapter Nine – Transportation, as well as other provisions throughout the plan regarding pathways, roadway improvements, and lessening roadway congestion, identify key means to implement complete streets. As a result, the Township is compliant with this amendment.

Chapter Nine

Transportation

Introduction

Yellow highlights pending MDOT

Roadway function, efficiency and safety in Robinson Township can be furthered by defining a roadway classification system and planning and designing these facilities for their specific purpose. A functional system or hierarchy of roads provides for movement of traffic as well as access to specific sites. This hierarchy will range from principal arterials such as Lake Michigan Drive **and the M-231 Highway**, which primarily serves cross-county movement, to local subdivision streets that provide access to individual homes. This system defines the roles of each street, in terms of operational requirements; which is translated into planning, management and physical design features.

Principal Arterial

The Lake Michigan Drive corridor **and M-231 Highway** are major roadways through the heart of Ottawa County and serve a vital function toward connecting Robinson Township with developed areas in Grand Haven Charter Township, Allendale Charter Township and further east to the City of Grand Rapids and Kent County in general.

Collectors

The collectors serve to funnel traffic from local subdivision streets in residential neighborhoods to the arterials. Collectors also afford access to abutting properties. Many individual subdivisions contain one or more collector streets that carry traffic from the local streets and connect with adjacent neighborhoods.

Local and Private Streets

These interior streets provide access to abutting property and homes. These roadways are generally short and discontinuous and only provide connection to one or two collector streets.

Based upon the current view of the Township, the following is believed to be an adequate description of existing roads and highways:

TYPE	FUNCTION	SPEED	FEATURES
State Highway*	Thoroughfare through the Township.	55 to 65 mph.	Higher traffic volumes with generally wider right of ways.

Arterial**	Connects areas of the Township or a thoroughfare through the Township	55 mph.	Higher traffic volumes, sometimes wider right of ways.
Secondary	Provide connecting link between arterials and represent the location of most residences.	55 mph.	Moderate traffic, almost exclusively 66 feet right of way.
Private Street (serving more than 4 dwellings), typically paved.	Provide access to individual properties.	Unregulated by the County	Should be designed to discourage through traffic, 66 feet ROW for possible public dedication at a later date.
Private Street (serving 4 or fewer dwellings)	Provide access to a limited number of individual properties.	Unregulated by the County, however, length and condition limit speed.	Should be designed to discourage through traffic, 66 feet ROW for possible public dedication at a later date.

*State Highway

- M-45 (Lake Michigan Drive) from 144th Avenue to 96th Avenue
- M-231 from the Grand River to Lake Michigan Drive

**Arterial Streets

- 144th Avenue from M-45 to Green Street
- 128th Avenue from M-45 to Green Street
- 120th Avenue-- entire length of Township
- 104th Avenue -- M-45 to North Cedar Street
- 96th Avenue -- Fillmore Street to M-45
- Lincoln, 112th Avenue, Osborn, Bass Drive -- entire length
- Mercury Drive, Green Street, North Cedar Street—entire length
- Fillmore Street-- entire length

Overall, eighty-six percent (86%) of respondents to the Master Plan Update Community Survey indicated that the ease of travel between destinations within the Township was “excellent” or “good.” Approximately seventy percent (70%) of respondents indicated that planning for future road congestion was “important” or “very important.”

Pedestrians

Coupled with vehicle transportation, providing for pedestrian friendly means of travel are important to achieve complete streets within the Township.

Approximately seventy percent (70%) of respondents to the Master Plan Update Community Survey indicated that multi-use pathways for pedestrians, bicycles, and or equestrians are appropriate when adjacent to agriculture within the Township. Slightly over fifty percent (50%) of respondents indicated that adding bike lanes and paved shoulders along roads were “important” or “very important,” coupled with approximately twenty-four percent (24%) indicating that those were “somewhat important.”

As a result of public workshops, the Master Plan Update Community Survey, and various planning meetings we have concluded that the following goals are paramount for transportation within Robinson Township. In addition, through the use of modern planning principles, where applicable, recommendations regarding these goals as well as strategies to achieve success are provided below.

Goals, Recommendations, and Strategies

Goals

- Access points for traffic on Lake Michigan Drive should not be restricted by excessive driveway aprons
- An emphasis on interconnected drives and streets should be promoted so that internal trips can be made without compelling drivers to enter and exit the main road multiple times
- A system of integrated shared use paths should be promoted for all new developments to provide safe walking routes to surrounding uses

Recommendations

- Interconnect service drives to improve traffic distribution and to promote access management
- Minimize traffic disruptions on arterials, while keeping through traffic off of the local residential streets
- Promote a multimodal transportation system, encompassing bicycles, pedestrian, and automobile traffic

Strategies

- Require the layout of new residential developments to be extensions of existing neighborhoods, where possible. This should apply to roadway extensions and pedestrian pathways, to ensure interconnected neighborhoods.

- Consider adopting access management regulations, shared driveway regulations, and pedestrian pathway requirements within the Zoning Ordinance for all commercial and industrial uses

Complete Streets Plan

In 2010, the Michigan Planning Enabling Act was amended to require that Master Plans account for “all legal users” of the transportation system within the municipality. The amended Act, in part, states that the Master Plan must include, “among other things, promotion of or adequate provision for 1 or more of the following: (i) A system of transportation to lessen congestion on streets and provide for safe and efficient movement of people and goods by motor vehicles, bicycles, pedestrians, and other legal users.” MCL 125.3807(2)(d).

This Chapter of the Robinson Township Master Plan, Chapter Nine – Transportation, as well as other provisions throughout the plan regarding pathways, roadway improvements, and lessening roadway congestion, identify key means to implement complete streets. As a result, the Township is compliant with this amendment.

Chapter Ten Implementation

Introduction

In order for the Master Plan to serve as an effective guide to the continued development and preservation of Robinson Township, it must be properly implemented. Primary responsibility for implementing the Plan rests with the Robinson Township Planning Commission, the Board of Trustees, and Township staff. Implementation is accomplished through a number of methods including adoption of ordinances, policies, and administrative procedures, as well as site plan review. While the Master Plan itself has no legal authority to regulate development, it does influence land use based on the goals and recommendations identified within the Master Plan related to a proposed land use.

Zoning and Land Use Regulations

Zoning represents a legal means for the Township to regulate private property to achieve orderly land use relationships, and is the tool most commonly used to implement the Master Plan. The zoning process consists of an official Zoning Map and accompanying Zoning Ordinance text. The official Zoning Map divides the community into different districts within which certain uses are permitted. The Zoning Ordinance text establishes the permitted uses, regulations to control density, height, bulk, setbacks, lot sizes and accessory uses, among other physical and linear attributes. The Zoning Ordinance also sets forth procedures for special approval provisions and regulates accessory structures such as pole barns and signage. These measures permit the Township to control the quality as well as the type of development. Numerous strategies within this Plan are provided for future implementation into the Zoning Ordinance, as well other policy documents.

The Planning Commission and Township Board should periodically review and make any necessary revisions to the zoning regulations to ensure that the strategies of the Master Plan are instituted. Further, the Zoning Ordinance requires systematic and frequent updates to address needs resulting from land use trends, case law, and state statutes.

Relationship of Master Plan Classifications to Zoning Districts (Zoning Plan)

Complementing the text of the Master Plan is its map, which identifies land use classifications by which the Township organizes and intends future improvements and uses. These classification terms are intentionally general in nature so as to not necessarily be specific to one use or type of uses permitted by the Zoning Ordinance and its Map. In other words, while the land use classifications are related to the Zoning Districts identified on the Zoning Ordinance Map, specific future uses are determined by numerous natural and man-made features of the landscape such as public utilities, topography, soils, road improvements, surrounding uses, existing densities, and etcetera, as well as other planning considerations such as compatibility, public safety, and access. Consequently, while the land use classifications of the Master Plan Map are designed to serve as a guide for future uses, they are not considered to be a mandate for immediate improvements, public, private, or otherwise.

Ultimately, while the Master Plan Map identifies areas for future uses, the feasibility of a proposed use is determined by the aforementioned, and the Zoning Ordinance with its regulations regarding height, area, bulk, location, etcetera for each of its Zoning Districts.

~~Nonetheless, the Michigan Planning Enabling Act requires that a Master Plan include a "Zoning Plan" with an "explanation of how the land use categories on the future land use map relate to the districts on the zoning map (MCL 125.3833)." As zoning is the one of the primary Sub Area Plan implementation tools, this same element is incorporated into the plan. The Table 5 below summarizes the future land use designations Master Plan classifications and indicates how they relate to each of the existing zoning districts.~~ (Moved from page 45, M-231 Sub-area Plan)

Future Land Use Category	Zoning District
Neighborhood Business	B-1, Neighborhood Commercial Zoning District. This Zoning District is intended for neighborhood convenience shopping where retail business or service establishments supply commodities or perform services to meet the daily needs of the neighborhood. The intent of this Zoning District is also to encourage the concentration of business uses, to the mutual advantage of both the consumers and merchants, and thereby avoid the encouragement of marginal business throughout the community.
Highway Commercial	B-2, General Business Zoning District. This Zoning District is intended to provide for the construction or continued use of land for general community wide commercial and service uses and to provide for orderly development and concentration of such uses to satisfy the needs of the overall community. Within this Zoning District, linear or strip commercial development shall be discouraged.
Community Commercial	B-2, General Business Zoning District. This Zoning District is intended to provide for the construction or continued use of land for general community wide commercial and service uses and to provide for orderly development and concentration of such uses to satisfy the needs of the overall community. Within this Zoning District, linear or strip commercial development shall be discouraged.
Industrial	I-1, Industrial Zoning District. This Zoning District is intended to provide for light industrial uses involving assembly and/or fabrication, the retailing and/or wholesaling of products, and service oriented businesses which cause a minimum of adverse effect beyond the boundaries of the site upon which they are located.

Agricultural	A 1, Agricultural Zoning District. This Zoning District is intended to preserve and protect important farmlands from encroachment by conflicting non farm uses and to restrict non farm residential uses from locating in farmland areas where the greatest conflicts might arise. Areas included in this zone have been found to be prime or unique agricultural lands due to crop productivity and/or special soil characteristics. To meet the intent of this zone, uses permitted by right in this zone are those which generally preserve, promote, maintain and enhance agriculture. Non agricultural uses, structures or activities which create conflicts with or are negatively affected by agriculture are prohibited.
Remainder	See Township Master Plan

(Moved from page 45, M-231 Sub-area Plan)

Master Plan Map Classification Terms	Zoning Ordinance Map Districts
Agricultural (AG)	Agricultural (A-1) & Agricultural Service (A-2), Rural Residential (RR)
Low Density Residential (LDR)	Rural Residential (RR)
Medium Density Residential (MDR)	Residential One-Family (R-1)
High Density Residential (HDR)	Residential Multiple-Family (R-2)
Flood Plain (E-1)	Lowland Resource Conservation Overlay (E-1)
Commercial (C)	Neighborhood Commercial (B-1) & General Business (B-2)
Industrial (I)	Industrial (I-1) & (I-2)
M-231 Primary Growth Area	Lake Michigan Drive Commercial Overlay (LMDCOD)
M-231 Secondary Growth Area	Lincoln Street Overlay (LSOD)

Mining District

Previously, areas to be mined commercially were recognized as an industrial zoning use for this purpose. Given that mining rights within the State of Michigan can potentially allow mineral extraction anywhere within the Township, the Mining District within the Robinson Township Zoning Ordinance is an interim district that permits and regulates mining activities. When the mineral extraction is complete, the property requires rezoning to a zoning district that is consistent with this Master Plan, that is compatible with the surrounding zoning districts and uses, and supports the capability of the subject property to accommodate the available uses of the zoning district. Therefore, areas of mining and any post-excavation use are not necessarily appropriate for industrial activity. (Moved from the Draft Chapter 6 Pursuant to May Planning Commission Direction)

Relationship of Master Plan Map Classification Terms to Master Plan Chapters

Several Chapters of this Master Plan identify the goals, recommendations, and strategies regarding future land uses within the Township. While the goals, recommendations, and strategies will likely always evolve, the intended uses related to the chapter titles will remain the same. Those chapter titles can generally be related to the Master Plan Map terms as provided in the table below.

Master Plan Map Classification Terms	Master Plan Chapters
Agricultural (AG)	Agricultural Uses
Low Density Residential (LDR)	Residential Uses
Medium Density Residential (MDR)	Residential Uses
High Density Residential (HDR)	Residential Uses
Flood Plain (E-1)	Lowland Resource Conservation
Commercial (C)	Commercial Uses & M-231 Commercial Uses
Industrial (I)	Industrial Uses & M-231 Industrial Uses
M-231 Primary Growth Area	Commercial Uses & M-231 Commercial Uses / Industrial Uses & M-231 Industrial Uses
M-231 Secondary Growth Area	Commercial Uses & M-231 Commercial Uses

Chapter Ten Implementation

Introduction

In order for the Master Plan to serve as an effective guide to the continued development and preservation of Robinson Township, it must be properly implemented. Primary responsibility for implementing the Plan rests with the Robinson Township Planning Commission, the Board of Trustees, and Township staff. Implementation is accomplished through a number of methods including adoption of ordinances, policies, and administrative procedures, as well as site plan review. While the Master Plan itself has no legal authority to regulate development, it does influence land use based on the goals and recommendations identified within the Master Plan related to a proposed land use.

Zoning and Land Use Regulations

Zoning represents a legal means for the Township to regulate private property to achieve orderly land use relationships and is the tool most commonly used to implement the Master Plan. The zoning process consists of an official Zoning Map and accompanying Zoning Ordinance text. The official Zoning Map divides the community into different districts within which certain uses are permitted. The Zoning Ordinance text establishes the permitted uses, regulations to control density, height, bulk, setbacks, lot sizes and accessory uses, among other physical and linear attributes. The Zoning Ordinance also sets forth procedures for special approval provisions and regulates accessory structures such as pole barns and signage. These measures permit the Township to control the quality as well as the type of development. Numerous strategies within this Plan are provided for future implementation into the Zoning Ordinance, as well other policy documents.

The Planning Commission and Township Board should periodically review and make any necessary revisions to the zoning regulations to ensure that the strategies of the Master Plan are instituted. Further, the Zoning Ordinance requires systematic and frequent updates to address needs resulting from land use trends, case law, and state statutes.

Relationship of Master Plan Classifications to Zoning Districts (Zoning Plan)

Complementing the text of the Master Plan is its map, which identifies land use classifications by which the Township organizes and intends future improvements and uses. These classification terms are intentionally general in nature so as to not necessarily be specific to one use or type of uses permitted by the Zoning Ordinance and its Map. In other words, while the land use classifications are related to the Zoning Districts identified on the Zoning Ordinance Map, specific future uses are determined by numerous natural and man-made features of the landscape such as public utilities, topography, soils, road improvements, surrounding uses, existing densities, and etcetera, as well as other planning considerations such as compatibility, public safety, and access. Consequently, while the land use classifications of the Master Plan Map are designed to serve as

a guide for future uses, they are not considered to be a mandate for immediate improvements, public, private, or otherwise.

Ultimately, while the Master Plan Map identifies areas for future uses, the feasibility of a proposed use is determined by the aforementioned, and the Zoning Ordinance with its regulations regarding height, area, bulk, location, etcetera for each of its Zoning Districts.

Nonetheless, the Michigan Planning Enabling Act requires that a Master Plan include a "Zoning Plan" with an "explanation of how the land use categories on the future land use map relate to the districts on the zoning map. The table below summarizes the Master Plan classifications and how they relate to each of the existing zoning districts.

Master Plan Map Classification Terms	Zoning Ordinance Map Districts
Agricultural (AG)	Agricultural (A-1) & Agricultural Service (A-2), Rural Residential (RR)
Low Density Residential (LDR)	Rural Residential (RR)
Medium Density Residential (MDR)	Residential One-Family (R-1)
High Density Residential (HDR)	Residential Multiple-Family (R-2)
Flood Plain (E-1)	Lowland Resource Conservation Overlay (E-1)
Commercial (C)	Neighborhood Commercial (B-1) & General Business (B-2)
Industrial (I)	Industrial (I-1) & (I-2)
M-231 Primary Growth Area	Lake Michigan Drive Commercial Overlay (LMDCOD)
M-231 Secondary Growth Area	Lincoln Street Overlay (LSOD)

Mining District

Previously, areas to be mined commercially were recognized as an industrial zoning use for this purpose. Given that mining rights within the State of Michigan can potentially allow mineral extraction anywhere within the Township, the Mining District within the Robinson Township Zoning Ordinance is an interim district that permits and regulates mining activities. When the mineral extraction is complete, the property requires rezoning to a zoning district that is consistent with this Master Plan, that is compatible with the surrounding zoning districts and uses, and supports the capability of the subject property to accommodate the available uses of the zoning district. Therefore, areas of mining and any post-excavation use are not necessarily appropriate for industrial activity.

Relationship of Master Plan Map Classification Terms to Master Plan Chapters

Several Chapters of this Master Plan identify the goals, recommendations, and strategies regarding future land uses within the Township. While the goals, recommendations, and strategies will likely

always evolve, the intended uses related to the chapter titles will remain the same. Those chapter titles can generally be related to the Master Plan Map terms as provided in the table below.

Master Plan Map Classification Terms	Master Plan Chapters
Agricultural (AG)	Agricultural Uses
Low Density Residential (LDR)	Residential Uses
Medium Density Residential (MDR)	Residential Uses
High Density Residential (HDR)	Residential Uses
Flood Plain (E-1)	Lowland Resource Conservation
Commercial (C)	Commercial Uses & M-231 Commercial Uses
Industrial (I)	Industrial Uses & M-231 Industrial Uses
M-231 Primary Growth Area	Commercial Uses & M-231 Commercial Uses / Industrial Uses & M-231 Industrial Uses
M-231 Secondary Growth Area	Commercial Uses & M-231 Commercial Uses

Appendix

Available within this appendix is the following data

Appendix A – Community Mapping

Appendix B – M-231 Growth Areas

Appendix C – Population and Economic Data, Robinson Township

Appendix A

Community Mapping

Following are the community maps as well as their established purpose, which are incorporated as part of the Master Plan. These maps are not intended to be limited to their purposes provided below but rather establish a minimum relationship to the Master Plan.

- **Future Land Use Map** – creates future land use classifications and delineates boundaries for certain uses of land.
- **Soil Limitations Map** - illustrates soil limitations for septic systems to illustrate feasibility of supporting proposed development.
- **Agricultural and Open Space Lands** – illustrates the existing agricultural and open space lands within the Township.
- **Parks & Recreation Area Map** – illustrates existing parks & recreation areas available to the public within the Township.
- **Water Supply System Master Plan** – illustrates the location of existing and future planned water supply infrastructure within the Township to illustrate feasibility of supporting proposed development.
- **Natural Gas Suppliers Map** – illustrates the location of natural gas utilities and suppliers within the Township to illustrate feasibility of supporting proposed development.
- **Marathon Pipeline Map** – illustrates the general location of the Marathon Pipeline within the Township.
- **Electricity Suppliers Map** – illustrates the location of electric utilities and suppliers within the Township to illustrate feasibility of supporting proposed development.
- **Robinson Township Topography Map** – illustrates the topography within the Township to illustrate feasibility of supporting proposed development.
- **Air Strips Map** – illustrates the location of existing air strips within the Township.
- **Designated Truck Route Map** – illustrates the location of existing truck routes within the Township.
- **Publicly Owned: Paved and Gravel Roads** – illustrates the location and paving material of existing public roads within the Township.
- **School Districts Map** – illustrates boundaries of public school districts within the Township.
- **Drains & Water Course** – illustrates the location of drains and water courses throughout the Township to illustrate feasibility of supporting proposed development.

Appendix B

M-231 Growth Areas

Following is the...

- Growth Boundary Factors
- Table 1: Growth Boundaries – Development Suitability Factors
- Table 2: Average Daily Traffic and Projections
- Map 1: M-231 Traffic Impact
- Map 2: Development Concept – Primary Growth Area
- Map 3: Development Concept – Secondary Growth Area
- Map 4: Particular Affected Area
- Map 5: Future Land Use – Primary Growth and Rural Areas
- Map 6: Future Land Use – Secondary Growth Area
- Map 7: Potential Parks & Trail Projects
- Map 8: Transportation Facilities
- Map 9: Existing Land Use

GROWTH BOUNDARY FACTORS – RETAINED from 2015 M-231 Sub-Area Plan

Delineation of growth boundaries and future land uses are based on a variety of objective and subjective factors. Although factors are not weighted, prioritized, or exclusive, an assessment of information concerning all factors and a cumulative evaluation of the factors serve as the basis for the Robinson Township growth strategy.

1. Road infrastructure (Existing and Planned). Roads are an essential component of community infrastructure and are integral to land use decisions. Therefore, it is critical to ensure that the primary function of arterial roads (such as M-45 and Lincoln} which is to carry relatively high volumes of traffic long distances, is not compromised by inappropriate uses. All too often, the higher traffic volumes and greater visibility of arterial corridors entices businesses seeking that increased exposure to customer traffic. However, if not controlled, the proliferation of individual driveways and frequent in and out turning movements diminishes the capacity of the road and impedes its basic function to move traffic. Therefore, a delicate balance must be maintained between preserving the traffic-carrying function of the arterial road and permitting uses that depend on that traffic.
2. Soils and Natural Resources. Hydric soils are generally considered unsuitable for development due to their historically wet conditions. These soils are typically saturated through a significant part of the growing season or flooded long enough to eliminate oxygen in the root zone. According to the Robinson Township Hazard Mitigation plan, areas with hydric soils "are to be considered flood-prone, wetland, or otherwise suited to have development discouraged or specifically engineered to account for site hydrology." Therefore, the presence of such soils is considered a significant constraint to development due to their instability for buildings and limitations for on-site septic systems.
3. Existing Land Use. Established land use patterns must be considered in determining potential future land use options. Except in rare circumstances where redevelopment is advocated, the existing land use context must be a shaping influence as future land use options are explored. Intensive land uses may not be compatible and could potentially affect historically residential or agricultural areas negatively by reducing property values, increasing traffic, or creating nuisances (noise, hours of operation, glare, odor, etc.).
4. Future Land Use and Zoning. Development should emanate incrementally outward from areas targeted for growth through conscious land use planning. A logical, orderly, sequential growth pattern allows for the gradual expansion of needed infrastructure and other municipal services in a cost-effective and efficient manner. The Township Master Plan and this Growth Area Plan strive to manage growth and diminish incompatible land use relationships. Zoning regulations are the fundamental tools to support plan recommendations. They should ensure that appropriate uses are situated in conformance with the plan and an orderly transition is accomplished from intense uses to very low intensity uses.
5. Survey and Community Preference. Local desires are an important ingredient in any planning effort. All communities are different, local philosophies vary and conditions may

be unique. During past planning efforts, residents were surveyed to gauge their opinions regarding growth and development. The results of that survey provided valuable direction for the preparation of this plan.

6. Utilities. Water and sewer service infrastructure are critical determinants for land use intensity. Where public water and sewer are available, greater intensity of development is feasible. However, where such facilities are unavailable and private systems (septic and well) are employed, the range of potential uses and the intensity of development are severely limited.
7. Truck Routes. Except as expressly permitted under the Truck Route Ordinance, operation of heavy trucks and trailers is restricted to designated truck routes. As commercial and industrial developments are reliant upon trucks for deliveries and general operation, the most suitable lands are those that have direct access to truck routes in all directions.
8. Visibility and Demand. Commercial and industrial zoning map amendments, special land use review and site plan review requests are indicators of general demand for development. Additionally, visibility of property based on new traffic patterns and increase in the number of travelers in the township affects suitability.

The following table includes the application of the assessment factors as they related to the growth areas.

Table 1 Growth Boundaries- Development Suitability Factors

(RETAINED from 2015 M-231 Sub-Area Plan)

Planning Factor	Lincoln Street Focus Area	Lake Michigan Drive Focus Area	Outlying Areas
1. Road Infrastructure (Existing and Planned)	Medium • County Road- Lincoln Street • M-231	High • M-45 Lake Michigan Drive • M-231	Low • County secondary paved roads • County unpaved roads
2. Soils	Low • Hydric Soils	Low • Hydric Soils	Varies • Hydric and Non-Hydric Soils
3. Existing Land Use	Low • Low and medium density residential (north) • Agricultural land (south)	High • Generally agricultural and undeveloped • Existing commercial	Low • Agricultural uses • Low and medium density residential
4. Future Land Use and Zoning	Low • Existing low density residential zoning. • Low density residential future land use planned.	Medium/High • Existing commercial and industrial zoning • Commercial and industrial land use planned	Low • Existing residential zoning • Existing Residential future land use planned
5. Community Survey	Low • Development not desired.	Medium • Development more acceptable	Low • Development not desired
6. Utilities	Low • No existing or planned water and sewer.	Medium • No existing or planned water and sewer • Closer proximity to existing utilities	Low • No existing or planned water and sewer
7. Truck Routes	Medium • Truck routes travel in two directions.	High • Truck routes travel in all directions	Low • Trucks are generally prohibited
8. Visibility and Demand	Medium • New bypass traffic capture- significant increase on Lincoln west of M-231 (see	Medium/High • Regionally significant intersection	Low • No bypass traffic capture or increases anticipated

	traffic projections in Table 2 and Map 1).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New bypass traffic capture: travelers will stop for convenience-oriented needs but the location will not be a "destination." Some commercial developers may seek to take advantage of a key location and a potential new market resulting from the new hub at Lake Michigan Drive and M-231 (see traffic projections in Table 2 and Map 1).
Overall Score	Low/Medium Consolidated low-intensity commercial around new intersection to the southwest of the Lincoln/M-231 intersection.	Medium/High Designation of existing commercial and industrial future land use areas as priority area for future development.
Recommendation		Low No change in growth concept.

Table 2 Average Daily Traffic and Projections

(RETAINED from 2015 M-231 Sub-Area Plan)

Road Segment	2006 Count	2030 Projected without M-231	2006-2030 Change	2030 Projected with M-231	2006-2030 Change (M-231)	2030 Difference due to Bypass
Lincoln west of M-231	4,300	6,800	58%	11,100	158%	4,300
Lincoln east of M-231	2,500	4,200	68%	4,800	92%	600
120th north of Lincoln	1,200	1,900	58%	2,300	92%	400
120th south of Lincoln	3,000	4,100	37%	2,400	-20%	-1,700
120th south of M-45	4,000	5,000	25%	8,200	105%	3,200
M-45 west of M-231	5,400	7,300	35%	8,400	56%	1,000
M-45 east of M-231	7,000	7,300	4%	14,100	101%	6,800
M-231 north of Lincoln				22,000		

M-231 south of Lincoln		10,000
------------------------	--	--------

Appendix C

Population and Economic Data

The following tables collected from the U.S. Census Bureau and the Ottawa County Department of Strategic Impact are included as a reference to the make up of Robinson Township's Population and Economic Characteristics. The narratives below were created using data from the tables.

- Table 1: Ottawa County, Michigan Decennial Population Data

From 1980 to 2010 Robinson Township was in the top half of municipalities in Ottawa County for population growth. This trend did not continue into 2020. From 2010 to 2020, Robinson Township was in the bottom third of Ottawa County municipalities for population growth.

- Table 2: Data Profile: Selected Social Characteristics

An overwhelming majority (90%) of Robinson Township residents live in the same place they did one year ago. Of the occupied housing units in Robinson Township, 70% are occupied by married couples. Lastly, of the 1,499 individuals enrolled in school, a majority (55%) are enrolled in grades one through eight.

- Table 3: Data Profile: Selected Economic Characteristics

Robinson Township has 4,666 residents that are 16 or older; of which 67% (3,166) are in the labor force. For residents in the labor force 95% are employed with a majority (88%) commuting to work alone. Most residents are employed in the manufacturing (25.4%), retail (7.7%), construction (7.5), and agricultural (7.2%) industries.

The median household income for Robinson Township is \$81,287 with 67% of households earning between \$50,000 and \$149,000 annually.

- Table 4: Data Profile: Selected Housing Characteristics

Approximately 97% of the housing units in Robinson Township are occupied, with a majority being owner-occupied. Of the 2,019 housing units in the Township, 46% have been built since 1990, with 54% being built in or before 1989. Two-thirds of housing units are heated using natural gas.

The median house value is \$235,300.

- Table 5: Data Profile: Demographic and Housing Estimates

Robinson Township has a total population of 6,466 individuals of which 53% are male and 47% are female. The median age is 37 with 96.7% of residents being white.

TABLE 1:
Ottawa County, Michigan Decennial Population Data

1980-1990			1990-2000			2000-2010			2010-2020		
Unit of Government	80-90 #	1990	Unit of Government	90-00 #	2000	Unit of Government	00-10 #	2010	Unit of Government	10-20 #	2020
Georgetown Township	6,568	32,672	Holland Township	11,388	28,911	Allendale Township	7,666	20,708	Georgetown Township	7,156	54,141
Holland Township	3,784	17,523	Georgetown Township	8,986	41,658	Holland Township	6,725	35,636	Allendale Township	5,614	26,322
Holland City (Ottawa pt)	3,319	25,086	Allendale Township	5,020	13,042	Georgetown Township	5,327	46,985	Grand Haven Township	2,859	18,037
Park Township	3,187	13,541	Park Township	4,038	17,579	Zeeland Township	2,358	9,971	Holland Township	2,730	38,366
Grand Haven Township	2,472	9,710	Grand Haven Township	3,568	13,278	Jamestown Township	1,972	7,034	Jamestown Township	2,615	9,649
Allendale Township	1,942	8,022	Zeeland Township	3,141	7,613	Grand Haven Township	1,900	15,178	Zeeland Township	2,062	12,033
Spring Lake Township	1,357	8,214	Holland City (Ottawa pt)	2,760	27,846	Spring Lake Township	1,351	11,977	Blendon Township	1,323	7,095
Hudsonville City	1,326	6,170	Spring Lake Township	2,412	10,626	Tallmadge Township	694	7,575	Tallmadge Township	1,240	8,815
Holland City (Allegan pt)	1,278	5,792	Olive Township	1,825	4,691	Robinson Township	496	6,084	Port Sheldon Township	969	5,209
Blendon Township	977	4,740	Robinson Township	1,663	5,588	Copersville City	365	4,275	Park Township	871	18,673
Robinson Township	907	3,925	Port Sheldon Township	1,574	4,503	Park Township	223	17,802	Spring Lake Township	803	12,780
Zeeland Township	761	4,472	Holland City (Allegan pt)	1,410	7,202	Crockery Township	178	3,960	Holland City (Allegan pt)	712	7,728
Port Sheldon Township	723	2,929	Jamestown Township	1,003	5,062	Polkton Township	88	2,423	Crockery Township	621	4,581
Zeeland City	653	5,417	Hudsonville City	990	7,160	Blendon Township	51	5,772	Grand Haven City	605	11,017
Copersville City	532	3,421	Blendon Township	981	5,721	Olive Township	44	4,735	Copersville City	562	4,837
Jamestown Township	513	4,059	Tallmadge Township	581	6,881	Hudsonville City	(44)	7,116	Hudsonville City	523	7,639
Ferrysburg Village	479	2,919	Copersville City	489	3,910	Wright Township	(139)	3,147	Holland City (Ottawa pt)	479	26,514
Olive Township	417	2,866	Zeeland City	388	5,805	Ferrysburg Village	(148)	2,892	Robinson Township	313	6,397
Tallmadge Township	373	6,300	Crockery Township	183	3,782	Holland City (Allegan pt)	(186)	7,016	Olive Township	278	5,013
Polkton Township	250	2,277	Chester Township	182	2,315	Spring Lake Village	(191)	2,323	Zeeland City	219	5,723
Grand Haven City	188	11,951	Ferrysburg Village	121	3,040	Port Sheldon Township	(263)	4,240	Spring Lake Village	217	2,540
Chester Township	99	2,133	Polkton Township	58	2,335	Chester Township	(298)	2,017	Polkton Township	148	2,571
Crockery Township	63	3,599	Wright Township	1	3,286	Zeeland City	(301)	5,504	Chester Township	85	2,102
Wright Township	(102)	3,285	Spring Lake Village	(23)	2,514	Grand Haven City	(756)	10,412	Ferrysburg Village	63	2,955
Spring Lake Village	(194)	2,537	Grand Haven City	(783)	11,168	Holland City (Ottawa pt)	(1,811)	26,035	Wright Township	44	3,191
Unit of Government	80-90 #	1990	Unit of Government	90-00 #	2000	Unit of Government	00-10 #	2010	Unit of Government	10-20 #	2020
Ottawa County	30,594	187,768	Ottawa County	50,546	238,314	Ottawa County	25,487	263,801	Ottawa County	32,399	296,200
Michigan	33,243	9,295,287	Michigan	643,157	9,938,444	Michigan	(54,804)	9,883,640	Michigan	193,691	10,077,331

TABLE 2:
2020 American Community Survey 5-year Estimates
Data Profile: Selected Social Characteristics

	Estimate
HOUSEHOLDS BY TYPE	
Total households	1,971
Married-couple household	1,390
With children of the householder under 18 years	(X)
Cohabiting couple household	79
With children of the householder under 18 years	(X)
Male householder, no spouse/partner present	260
With children of the householder under 18 years	(X)
Householder living alone	162
65 years and over	61
Female householder, no spouse/partner present	242
With children of the householder under 18 years	(X)
Householder living alone	85
65 years and over	32
Households with one or more people under 18 years	746
Households with one or more people 65 years and over	550
Average household size	3
Average family size	4
RELATIONSHIP	
Population in households	6,372
Householder	1,971
Spouse	1,355
Unmarried partner	76
Child	2,126
Other relatives	641
Other nonrelatives	203

MARITAL STATUS	
Males 15 years and over	2,514
Never married	746
Now married, except separated	1,551
Separated	-
Widowed	58
Divorced	159
Females 15 years and over	2,218
Never married	409
Now married, except separated	1,457
Separated	45
Widowed	159
Divorced	148
FERTILITY	
Number of women 15 to 50 years old who had a birth in the past 12 months	70
Unmarried women (widowed, divorced, and never married)	11
Per 1,000 unmarried women	23
Per 1,000 women 15 to 50 years old	54
Per 1,000 women 15 to 19 years old	-
Per 1,000 women 20 to 34 years old	108
Per 1,000 women 35 to 50 years old	25
GRANDPARENTS	
Number of grandparents living with own grandchildren under 18 years	189
Grandparents responsible for grandchildren	81
Years responsible for grandchildren	
Less than 1 year	-
1 or 2 years	16
3 or 4 years	7
5 or more years	58
Number of grandparents responsible for own grandchildren under 18 years	81
Who are female	40
Who are married	74
SCHOOL ENROLLMENT	
Population 3 years and over enrolled in school	1,499
Nursery school, preschool	70
Kindergarten	136
Elementary school (grades 1-8)	825
High school (grades 9-12)	281
College or graduate school	187

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	
Population 25 years and over	4,144
Less than 9th grade	146
9th to 12th grade, no diploma	262
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	1,326
Some college, no degree	885
Associate's degree	491
Bachelor's degree	715
Graduate or professional degree	319
High school graduate or higher	3,736
Bachelor's degree or higher	1,034
VETERAN STATUS	
Civilian population 18 years and over	4,506
Civilian veterans	381
DISABILITY STATUS OF THE CIVILIAN NONINSTITUTIONALIZED POPULATION	
Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population	6,466
With a disability	751
Under 18 years	1,960
With a disability	112
18 to 64 years	3,674
With a disability	376
65 years and over	832
With a disability	263
RESIDENCE 1 YEAR AGO	
Population 1 year and over	6,396
Same house	5,805
Different house (in the U.S. or abroad)	591
Different house in the U.S.	575
Same county	542
Different county	33
Same state	20
Different state	13
Abroad	16
PLACE OF BIRTH	
Total population	6,466
Native	6,157
Born in United States	6,117
State of residence	5,201
Different state	916
Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s)	40
Foreign born	309

U.S. CITIZENSHIP STATUS	
Foreign-born population	309
Naturalized U.S. citizen	146
Not a U.S. citizen	163
YEAR OF ENTRY	
Population born outside the United States	349
Native	40
Entered 2010 or later	-
Entered before 2010	40
Foreign born	309
Entered 2010 or later	73
Entered before 2010	236
WORLD REGION OF BIRTH OF FOREIGN BORN	
Foreign-born population, excluding population born at sea	309
Europe	10
Asia	75
Africa	-
Oceania	-
Latin America	217
Northern America	7
LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME	
Population 5 years and over	6,111
English only	5,632
Language other than English	479
Speak English less than "very well"	280
Spanish	396
Speak English less than "very well"	246
Other Indo-European languages	10
Speak English less than "very well"	-
Asian and Pacific Islander languages	5
Speak English less than "very well"	5
Other languages	68
Speak English less than "very well"	29

ANCESTRY	
Total population	6,466
American	312
Arab	50
Czech	11
Danish	6
Dutch	1,587
English	400
French (except Basque)	125
French Canadian	5
German	1,287
Greek	43
Hungarian	23
Irish	961
Italian	66
Lithuanian	-
Norwegian	60
Polish	487
Portuguese	-
Russian	-
Scotch-Irish	63
Scottish	48
Slovak	17
Subsaharan African	-
Swedish	90
Swiss	6
Ukrainian	37
Welsh	5
West Indian (excluding Hispanic origin groups)	-
COMPUTERS AND INTERNET USE	
Total households	1,971
With a computer	1,899
With a broadband Internet subscription	1,757

TABLE 3:
2020 American Community Survey 5-year Estimates
Data Profile: Selected Economic Characteristics

	Estimate
EMPLOYMENT STATUS	
Population 16 years and over	4,666
In labor force	3,116
Civilian labor force	3,116
Employed	2,983
Unemployed	133
Armed Forces	-
Not in labor force	1,550
Civilian labor force	3,116
Unemployment Rate	(X)
Females 16 years and over	2,195
In labor force	1,271
Civilian labor force	1,271
Employed	1,215
Own children of the householder under 6 years	466
All parents in family in labor force	339
Own children of the householder 6 to 17 years	1,489
All parents in family in labor force	785
COMMUTING TO WORK	
Workers 16 years and over	2,930
Car, truck, or van -- drove alone	2,530
Car, truck, or van -- carpooled	271
Public transportation (excluding taxicab)	-
Walked	6
Other means	2
Worked from home	121
Mean travel time to work (minutes)	23
OCCUPATION	
Civilian employed population 16 years and over	2,983
Management, business, science, and arts occupations	1,035
Service occupations	405
Sales and office occupations	561
Natural resources, construction, and maintenance occupations	485
Production, transportation, and material moving occupations	497

INDUSTRY	
Civilian employed population 16 years and over	2,983
Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining	217
Construction	224
Manufacturing	758
Wholesale trade	74
Retail trade	230
Transportation and warehousing, and utilities	155
Information	48
Finance and insurance, and real estate and rental and leasing	91
Professional, scientific, and management, and administrative and waste management services	206
Educational services, and health care and social assistance	506
Arts, entertainment, and recreation, and accommodation and food services	211
Other services, except public administration	159
Public administration	104
CLASS OF WORKER	
Civilian employed population 16 years and over	2,983
Private wage and salary workers	2,570
Government workers	268
Self-employed in own not incorporated business workers	145
Unpaid family workers	-

INCOME AND BENEFITS (IN 2020 INFLATION-ADJUSTED DOLLARS)	
Total households	1,971
Less than \$10,000	26
\$10,000 to \$14,999	18
\$15,000 to \$24,999	62
\$25,000 to \$34,999	87
\$35,000 to \$49,999	149
\$50,000 to \$74,999	494
\$75,000 to \$99,999	398
\$100,000 to \$149,999	429
\$150,000 to \$199,999	214
\$200,000 or more	94
Median household income (dollars)	81,287
Mean household income (dollars)	95,831
With earnings	1,680
Mean earnings (dollars)	90,876
With Social Security	668
Mean Social Security income (dollars)	27,053
With retirement income	447
Mean retirement income (dollars)	22,220
With Supplemental Security Income	115
Mean Supplemental Security Income (dollars)	11,865
With cash public assistance income	71
Mean cash public assistance income (dollars)	3,410
With Food Stamp/SNAP benefits in the past 12 months	80
Families	1,637
Less than \$10,000	8
\$10,000 to \$14,999	9
\$15,000 to \$24,999	24
\$25,000 to \$34,999	63
\$35,000 to \$49,999	110
\$50,000 to \$74,999	370
\$75,000 to \$99,999	405
\$100,000 to \$149,999	344
\$150,000 to \$199,999	214
\$200,000 or more	90
Median family income (dollars)	85,766
Mean family income (dollars)	102,011
Per capita income (dollars)	29,397
Nonfamily households	334
Median nonfamily income (dollars)	51,058
Mean nonfamily income (dollars)	57,690
Median earnings for workers (dollars)	36,603
Median earnings for male full-time, year-round workers (dollars)	60,168
Median earnings for female full-time, year-round workers (dollars)	39,659

HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE	
Civilian noninstitutionalized population	6,466
With health insurance coverage	6,358
With private health insurance	5,238
With public coverage	2,142
No health insurance coverage	108
Civilian noninstitutionalized population under 19 years	2,015
No health insurance coverage	10
Civilian noninstitutionalized population 19 to 64 years	3,619
In labor force:	2,902
Employed:	2,781
With health insurance coverage	2,712
With private health insurance	2,592
With public coverage	182
No health insurance coverage	69
Unemployed:	121
With health insurance coverage	121
With private health insurance	113
With public coverage	8
No health insurance coverage	-
Not in labor force:	717
With health insurance coverage	693
With private health insurance	482
With public coverage	365
No health insurance coverage	24
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES AND PEOPLE WHOSE INCOME IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS IS BELOW THE POVERTY LEVEL	
All families	(X)
With related children of the householder under 18 years	(X)
With related children of the householder under 5 years only	(X)
Married couple families	(X)
With related children of the householder under 18 years	(X)
With related children of the householder under 5 years only	(X)
Families with female householder, no spouse present	(X)
With related children of the householder under 18 years	(X)
With related children of the householder under 5 years only	(X)
All people	(X)
Under 18 years	(X)
Related children of the householder under 18 years	(X)
Related children of the householder under 5 years	(X)
Related children of the householder 5 to 17 years	(X)
18 years and over	(X)
18 to 64 years	(X)
65 years and over	(X)
People in families	(X)
Unrelated individuals 15 years and over	(X)

TABLE 4:
2020 American Community Survey 5-year Estimates
Data Profile: Selected Housing Characteristics

	Estimate
HOUSING OCCUPANCY	
Total housing units	2,019
Occupied housing units	1,971
Vacant housing units	48
Homeowner vacancy rate	-
Rental vacancy rate	-
UNITS IN STRUCTURE	
Total housing units	2,019
1-unit, detached	1,917
1-unit, attached	24
2 units	26
3 or 4 units	5
5 to 9 units	-
10 to 19 units	4
20 or more units	-
Mobile home	43
Boat, RV, van, etc.	-
YEAR STRUCTURE BUILT	
Total housing units	2,019
Built 2014 or later	110
Built 2010 to 2013	53
Built 2000 to 2009	264
Built 1990 to 1999	503
Built 1980 to 1989	241
Built 1970 to 1979	445
Built 1960 to 1969	146
Built 1950 to 1959	129
Built 1940 to 1949	39
Built 1939 or earlier	89

ROOMS	
Total housing units	2,019
1 room	-
2 rooms	-
3 rooms	14
4 rooms	272
5 rooms	363
6 rooms	343
7 rooms	270
8 rooms	300
9 rooms or more	457
Median rooms	7
BEDROOMS	
Total housing units	2,019
No bedroom	-
1 bedroom	28
2 bedrooms	327
3 bedrooms	959
4 bedrooms	515
5 or more bedrooms	190
HOUSING TENURE	
Occupied housing units	1,971
Owner-occupied	1,854
Renter-occupied	117
Average household size of owner-occupied unit	3
Average household size of renter-occupied unit	4
YEAR HOUSEHOLDER MOVED INTO UNIT	
Occupied housing units	1,971
Moved in 2019 or later	61
Moved in 2015 to 2018	283
Moved in 2010 to 2014	410
Moved in 2000 to 2009	451
Moved in 1990 to 1999	386
Moved in 1989 and earlier	380
VEHICLES AVAILABLE	
Occupied housing units	1,971
No vehicles available	45
1 vehicle available	321
2 vehicles available	794
3 or more vehicles available	811

HOUSE HEATING FUEL	
Occupied housing units	1,971
Utility gas	1,314
Bottled, tank, or LP gas	355
Electricity	98
Fuel oil, kerosene, etc.	15
Coal or coke	-
Wood	124
Solar energy	-
Other fuel	32
No fuel used	33
SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS	
Occupied housing units	1,971
Lacking complete plumbing facilities	-
Lacking complete kitchen facilities	-
No telephone service available	15
OCCUPANTS PER ROOM	
Occupied housing units	1,971
1.00 or less	1,912
1.01 to 1.50	53
1.51 or more	6
VALUE	
Owner-occupied units	1,854
Less than \$50,000	80
\$50,000 to \$99,999	38
\$100,000 to \$149,999	241
\$150,000 to \$199,999	352
\$200,000 to \$299,999	550
\$300,000 to \$499,999	516
\$500,000 to \$999,999	77
\$1,000,000 or more	-
Median (dollars)	235,300
MORTGAGE STATUS	
Owner-occupied units	1,854
Housing units with a mortgage	1,279
Housing units without a mortgage	575

SELECTED MONTHLY OWNER COSTS (SMOC)	
Housing units with a mortgage	1,279
Less than \$500	37
\$500 to \$999	208
\$1,000 to \$1,499	471
\$1,500 to \$1,999	345
\$2,000 to \$2,499	111
\$2,500 to \$2,999	44
\$3,000 or more	63
Median (dollars)	1,428
Housing units without a mortgage	575
Less than \$250	59
\$250 to \$399	130
\$400 to \$599	266
\$600 to \$799	89
\$800 to \$999	27
\$1,000 or more	4
Median (dollars)	477
SELECTED MONTHLY OWNER COSTS AS A PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME (SMOCAPI)	
Housing units with a mortgage (excluding units where SMOCAPI cannot be computed)	1,279
Less than 20.0 percent	726
20.0 to 24.9 percent	151
25.0 to 29.9 percent	198
30.0 to 34.9 percent	83
35.0 percent or more	121
Not computed	-
Housing unit without a mortgage (excluding units where SMOCAPI cannot be computed)	562
Less than 10.0 percent	335
10.0 to 14.9 percent	128
15.0 to 19.9 percent	25
20.0 to 24.9 percent	26
25.0 to 29.9 percent	34
30.0 to 34.9 percent	-
35.0 percent or more	14
Not computed	13

GROSS RENT	
Occupied units paying rent	63
Less than \$500	4
\$500 to \$999	30
\$1,000 to \$1,499	29
\$1,500 to \$1,999	-
\$2,000 to \$2,499	-
\$2,500 to \$2,999	-
\$3,000 or more	-
Median (dollars)	964
No rent paid	54
GROSS RENT AS A PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME (GRAPI)	
Occupied units paying rent (excluding units where GRAPI cannot be computed)	63
Less than 15.0 percent	27
15.0 to 19.9 percent	7
20.0 to 24.9 percent	24
25.0 to 29.9 percent	-
30.0 to 34.9 percent	-
35.0 percent or more	5
Not computed	54

TABLE 5:
2020 American Community Survey 5-year Estimates
Data Profile: Demographic and Housing Estimates

	Estimate
SEX AND AGE	
Total population	6,466
Male	3,442
Female	3,024
Sex ratio (males per 100 females)	114
Under 5 years	355
5 to 9 years	589
10 to 14 years	790
15 to 19 years	358
20 to 24 years	230
25 to 34 years	708
35 to 44 years	847
45 to 54 years	913
55 to 59 years	440
60 to 64 years	404
65 to 74 years	458
75 to 84 years	323
85 years and over	51
Median age (years)	37
Under 18 years	1,960
16 years and over	4,666
18 years and over	4,506
21 years and over	4,332
62 years and over	1,136
65 years and over	832
18 years and over	4,506
Male	2,344
Female	2,162
Sex ratio (males per 100 females)	108
65 years and over	832
Male	420
Female	412
Sex ratio (males per 100 females)	102

RACE	
Total population	6,466
One race	6,191
Two or more races	275
One race	6,191
White	5,982
Black or African American	21
American Indian and Alaska Native	28
Cherokee tribal grouping	-
Chippewa tribal grouping	-
Navajo tribal grouping	-
Sioux tribal grouping	-
Asian	16
Asian Indian	-
Chinese	16
Filipino	-
Japanese	-
Korean	-
Vietnamese	-
Other Asian	-
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	-
Native Hawaiian	-
Chamorro	-
Samoan	-
Other Pacific Islander	-
Some other race	144
Two or more races	275
White and Black or African American	-
White and American Indian and Alaska Native	36
White and Asian	-
Black or African American and American Indian and Alaska Native	-
Race alone or in combination with one or more other races	
Total population	6,466
White	6,257
Black or African American	21
American Indian and Alaska Native	64
Asian	16
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	-
Some other race	383

HISPANIC OR LATINO AND RACE	
Total population	6,466
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	529
Mexican	399
Puerto Rican	35
Cuban	58
Other Hispanic or Latino	37
Not Hispanic or Latino	5,937
White alone	5,670
Black or African American alone	21
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	28
Asian alone	16
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	-
Some other race alone	-
Two or more races	202
Two races including Some other race	166
Two races excluding Some other race, and Three or more races	36
Total housing units	2,019
CITIZEN, VOTING AGE POPULATION	
Citizen, 18 and over population	4,343
Male	2,221
Female	2,122

Sources:

Table 1: https://www.miottawa.org/Departments/Planning/county_statistics.htm

Table 2: <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?g=0600000US2613969000&tid=ACSDP5Y2020.DP02>

Table 3: <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?g=0600000US2613969000&tid=ACSDP5Y2020.DP03>

Table 4: <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?g=0600000US2613969000&tid=ACSDP5Y2020.DP04>

Table 5: <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?g=0600000US2613969000&tid=ACSDP5Y2020.DP05>

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

The Sub-Area Plan is intended to be the foundation for zoning decision-making and should be referenced during any consideration of a development with the study area. The strategy outlined in this section includes the specific tasks that should be completed to implement the recommendations of the plan. The objectives of the plan include both policy and action-oriented items:

- Policy: Protocol to guide decisions and achieve desired outcomes. Description of the intent of the Township regarding land use related issues at interchange areas (M-45 and Lincoln).
- Action: A statement of a specific task or series of tasks that must be accomplished to prepare for development pressures resulting from M-231.

POLICIES

The following general policies should be considered during review of all land development applications

1. Preserve the rural landscape and protect the existing rural community character and atmosphere.
 - a. Land outside of primary and secondary growth areas should be considered rural and subject to the guidance of the 2008 Robinson Township Master Plan.
 - b. Growth area boundaries may be re-evaluated but should only be changed under those circumstances outlined in the Sub-Area Plan.
2. Consolidate and focus future development within planned and prioritized target areas.
 - a. Commercial and Industrial development should not be considered outside of the primary and secondary growth areas unless previously planned and zoned for those purposes.
 - b. Consider zoning map amendments on a case-by-case basis.
3. Prioritize environmental and natural resource protection.
 - a. Zoning map amendments and development reviews should respect natural resources and environmental protection as a priority.
4. Ensure a safe multi-user transportation network, including sidewalks, pathways, crossings and access management through a comprehensive and coordinated development review process.
 - a. Developments shall incorporate non-motorized transportation and safety.
 - b. Partner with MDOT and Ottawa County Road Commission officials to begin cooperative development review processes at initial concept planning.
5. Capitalize on the opportunities for future parks, recreational facilities and trails.
 - a. Acquisition of public or MDOT owned land should be considered on a case-by case basis to meet projected parks and recreation level of service needs.
 - b. Off-road multi-use pathways should remain an option along the new M-231 ROW.



6. Promote harmonious and organized development consistent with adjacent land uses and ensure high quality site and building design that contributes to the character of the community.
 - a. The development concept maps should be used as a guide for growth scenarios.
 - b. Amend the zoning map on a case-by-case basis to ensure consistency with the Sub-Area Plan. Along with other implementation actions, including the overlay districts, the B-1 Zoning district will implement the Neighborhood Business future land use category while the B-2 Zoning District will implement the Highway and Community Commercial categories as underlying base zoning districts.
7. Restrict consideration of sewer infrastructure to planned priority development areas.
 - a. The Township should only support utility improvements in locations best suited for development that respects the managed growth and growth boundary recommendations of this plan.
 - b. Sewer services extension from adjacent townships should only be sized to accommodate the primary growth area.
 - c. When approving Special Land Uses (SLUs) within the Primary Growth Area under the future overlay district requirements, the Township Board will include the execution of a Special Assessment Agreement as a condition of approval.

ACTIONS

While the Township will rely on policies to guide future decision-making, the actions must be implemented to achieve the goals of the Master Plan. Therefore, it is essential to develop a prioritized "work plan" for the next five-year timeframe, identifying responsible parties, timeframes and priorities to ensure that the plan remains a dynamic and "living" document. Prioritization as it relates to timing is presented below:

- Priority 1: Projects are those that should be given an immediate and concentrated effort within six months of adoption.
- Priority 2: Projects necessary to implement the plan, but dependent upon commencement or completion of Priority 1 projects or do not have the same urgency of those projects (7-12 months from adoption).

The following tables include the action plan and implementation strategy for the Sub-Area Plan.

Table 6 Actions- Overlay District Development

Action	Priority and Timeframe
1. Create the Lincoln Street Neighborhood Business Overlay District. The overlay district shall regulate architecture, site design, building size, signs and allow non-commercial use through the Special Land Use Process.	First Priority- 6 months
2. Create the Lake Michigan Drive Commercial Overlay District. The overlay district shall regulate architecture, site design and building design.	First Priority- 6 months

Table 7 Actions- Site Plan Review

Action	Priority and Timeframe
1. Adopt general site development review standards to consider for all Township development, including but not limited to: Master Plan and Sub-Area Plan consistency, connectivity, traffic circulation, interior streets, stormwater, landscaping, screening, lighting, utility service, exterior uses, emergency access, water and sewer, signs and building design.	First Priority- 6 months
2. Adopt specific access management standards and strategies as a subsection of the Lake Michigan Drive Commercial Overlay District.	First Priority- 6 months
3. Adopt LID standards and requirements for all commercial development.	Second Priority- year 1

Table 8 Actions- General Development Requirements

Action	Priority and Timeframe
1. Adopt lighting requirements concerning maximum and minimum lighting levels, fixture height, fixture type and dark sky compliant lighting plans.	Second Priority- year 1
2. Adopt landscaping requirements, including but not limited to: parking lot landscaping, parking lot screening, front yard landscaping and buffers between potentially incompatible uses.	Second Priority- year 1
3. Adopt bicycle and pedestrian requirements for new development.	Second Priority- year 1