



Administrative Recommendation

City of Plymouth
201 S. Main
Plymouth, Michigan 48170-1637

www.plymouthmi.gov
Phone 734-453-1234
Fax 734-455-1892

To: Mayor & City Commission
From: Paul J. Sincock, City Manager
CC: S:\Manager\Sincock Files\Memorandum - Recreation Master Plan - Establish Public Hearing 10-16-23.docx
Date: October 12, 2023
RE: Recreation Master Plan – 30 Day review and establish Public Hearing

Background

The City Commission has been working with the Recreation Department on the new Recreation Master Plan. The City Commission authorized a statistically valid survey of the residents by Epic/MRA related to the Recreation Master Plan. The city also used an on-line survey which allowed people to indicate if they lived in the City or Township of Plymouth. Considering the wide-open nature of the on-line survey it is amazing how close the results between the two surveys are when responding to the various questions.

The next steps in the process of adoption of the Recreation Master Plan is to make this draft document available to the public for a 30-day window of public review. We will also need to set a formal public hearing date for November 20, 2023. After the public hearing we can then adopt the plan to become eligible for future State DNR grant applications. This would include land acquisition grants.

We have attached a memorandum from Recreation Director Steve Anderson which will provide additional background information on this matter. We have also attached a copy of the draft Recreation Master Plan and the appendices which includes the Epic/MRA Survey Results, and the online survey results.

Recommendation

The City Administration recommends that the City Commission accept the draft Parks and Recreation Master Plan for a 30-day period of public review and comment. Further, that the City Commission establish a public hearing on November 20, 2023, to accept comment related to the draft Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

We have attached a proposed Resolution for the City Commission to consider regarding this matter.



CITY OF PLYMOUTH


www.plymouthmi.gov

Recreation Department
Plymouth Cultural Center
525 Farmer
Plymouth, MI 48170

Phone 734-455-6620

Memo

To: Paul Sincock, City Manager

From: Steve Anderson, Recreation Director 

Date: 10/9/2023

Re: Request for City Commission approval to start thirty-day period of public review and set Public Hearing for the Recreation Master Plan.

As you are aware, we have completed the data collection and other processes required by the State of Michigan DNR for the creation of the 2024-2028 Recreation Master Plan. With these major hurdles cleared, we are starting to near the final steps of the Recreation Master Plan process.

The final steps are as follows:

- On October 16, 2023, we request that the City Commission officially start to the 30-day period of public review of the draft copy of the City Recreation Master Plan Document, as required by the DNR.
- If the 30-day period of review is approved by the City Commission, we will post as required in the proper newspaper publication by Oct. 20 and have the document available for public review on October 17
- We also ask the City Commission to set a public hearing for the Recreation Master Plan on November 20, 2023. This action would then satisfy that the required 30-day public review period is complete.
- After the public hearing on November 20, if the City Commission wishes to accept a final draft of the document, they can accept it by official resolution. This would then allow the staff to file the final document with the DNR, to then be eligible for the next round of DNR grant applications no later than April 1, 2024.

If approved, we will have the draft copy of the Recreation Master Plan as well as the associated appendices located at:

- City Hall – City Managers Office
- Cultural Center – Recreation Dept. Office
- The city web page at: www.plymouthmi.gov

A copy of the required public notice is listed below. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at any time.

CITY OF PLYMOUTH COMMISSION PUBLIC NOTICE

DRAFT PLAN AVAILABLE AND PUBLIC HEARING 5 YEAR PARKS AND RECREATION MASTER PLAN (2024-2028)

Notice is hereby given to any and all interested parties that a public hearing will be held by the Plymouth City Commission on **November 20, 2023 at 7:00 pm** at City Hall, located at 201 S Main. The public hearing is being held to receive comments on a draft City of Plymouth 5-Year Parks and Recreation Master Plan (2024-2028). The draft plan reflects the City's priorities for the next five years and, once adopted, will serve as a guide for City staff and the City Commission. **The draft Master Plan will be available for public review beginning October 20, 2023** on the City website at www.plymouthmi.gov, at City Hall, 201 S Main and at the Plymouth Cultural Center, 525 Farmer, during regular business hours.

All interested persons attending the hearing will be given an opportunity to be heard in respect to this matter. If you cannot attend this meeting, you may submit comments to the attention of Steve Anderson, Recreation Director at sanderson@plymouthmi.gov.

Maureen Brodie, Clerk
City of Plymouth



CITY OF PLYMOUTH
MICHIGAN

5 YEAR
PARKS + RECREATION
MASTER PLAN

2024 - 2028

**DRAFT FOR
COMMISSION REVIEW
OCTOBER 2023**


Adopted: January 2024
plymouthmi.gov



Nick Moroz, Mayor
Suzi Deal, Mayor Pro Tem
Linda Filipczak, Commissioner
Jennifer Kehoe, Commissioner
Alanna Maguire, Commissioner
Kelly O'Donnell, Commissioner
Marques Thomey, Commissioner

Paul Sincock, City Manager
Steve Anderson, Recreation Director
Brandon Szachta, Asst. Recreation Director
Ron Baase, Facility Operations Manager
Ian Anderson, Asst. Facility Manager

Adopted: _____



CONTENTS

4	Community Description
6	Planning Process
8	Administrative Structure
14	Inventory
39	Basis For Action
56	Action Plan
66	Appendix



COMMUNITY DESCRIPTION

The 2024-2028 City of Plymouth Parks and Recreation Plan was adopted by the Plymouth City Commission to serve as a guide and decision making document for future parks and recreation facilities and programs. The Plan presents an inventory of existing facilities and programs within the City as well as an evaluation of opportunities and needs. The Plan considers the existing facilities as well as the anticipated demand for additional or improved facilities and programs. The Plan also includes goals, objectives and a 5-Year Action Plan.

The jurisdiction and focus of this Master Plan is on the city-owned and operated parks and recreation facilities and programs. The Plan is also intended to enable the City to continue to apply for funding assistance from various agencies and work toward implementing the documented recommendations. This Plan specifically provides for five years of grant eligibility with the Michigan Department of Natural Resources.

The City of Plymouth is located in northwestern Wayne County, Michigan. Wayne County is the largest county in the State in terms of population, and encompasses the City of Detroit. Although the western portion of Wayne County was once primarily an agricultural area, the communities surrounding Plymouth are now highly urbanized including Plymouth Township, Northville, Northville Township, and Canton Township.

Native Americans lived in the area for centuries. The Tonquish band of Potawatomi were the last, leaving the area just before the first European settlers arrived in 1824. The first settlers of European origin arrived in the area in 1824 and by 1825 there were enough people to make up a small settlement. The Village of Plymouth was incorporated in 1867 and became a city in 1932.

According to the 2020 Census, the City of Plymouth has a population of 9,370 people (a 2.6 % increase from 2010). Major state highways and freeways include M-14, I-96 and I-275. These highways effectively connect the Plymouth community with the rest of the Detroit/Ann Arbor Metropolitan Area. The City is entirely surrounded by Plymouth Township. Other communities nearby include Northville Township and the City of Northville to the north, the City of Livonia to the east and Canton Township to the south. Salem Township (in Washtenaw County) is to the west.



PLANNING PROCESS

This Plan was developed utilizing the Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) Community Park, Recreation, Open Space and Greenway Plan Guidelines. Following the MDNR Guidelines, and filing this adopted Plan with the MDNR, allows the City to remain eligible to apply for various MDNR administered parks and recreation related grant funds. The 5-Year Plan was prepared by the City of Plymouth over an approximately 6-month period. The previous Plymouth Community Parks + Recreation Master Plan 2018-2022 was used as a foundation.

This section of the Plan documents the process used to develop the Plan as well as those involved with providing input.

Background Studies

The necessary data to begin the formulation of the background studies for the plan was collected from various sources including: City staff, City Department of Recreation, the previous Plymouth Community Parks + Recreation Master Plan 2018-2022 as well as field observations.

The Community Description includes a brief introduction to the City of Plymouth and the jurisdiction and focus of the Plan.

The Administrative Structure section of the Plan describes how recreation is governed and operated within the City. This includes information gathered from the City outlining staff responsibilities, function of the City Recreation Department, and a fiscal analysis (as it relates to recreation) of the last few years.

The Inventory chapter provides an overview of the parks and recreation facilities within the City of Plymouth. This information was collected through a field survey conducted in June and July 2023. The location of each facility is described and mapped, as well as an overview of the various programs, activities, and events offered throughout the City. The chapter also includes a brief description of public school recreational facilities, other significant recreation-related facilities in the community as well as regional recreation facilities in and around Plymouth.

Basis For Action

The Basis For Action section of the document analyzes factors inside and outside of the City that may have an effect on the direction of recreation over the next five years. This portion of the plan also helps to provide the rationale for the goals, guidelines/objectives and capital improvement priorities. Several factors were analyzed including current recreation trends (on both national and state levels), comparison of City acreage, staffing, budget levels to other typical parks and recreation agencies in the country, service area gaps, existing plans and reports, and results of the various input from residents, staff and elected officials.

Input

The City gathered input in a number of ways during the development of the plan as summarized below. Additional detail is provided in the Basis For Action section and Appendix.

Parks and Recreation Telephone Survey (Statistically Accurate)

The City funded a telephone survey of 264 adult residents of the City. The survey was conducted by EPIC-MRA based in Lansing and

completed in September 2023. Additional detail is provided in the Basis For Action section and Appendix.

Parks and Recreation Online Questionnaire

During the development of the Plan, the City posted a questionnaire to their website in order to give opportunity for people to provide written input for consideration. The availability of the questionnaire was published on social media and via email blasts. The questionnaire was available from September 18-27, 2023 and 371 responses were collected. Additional detail is provided in the Basis For Action section and Appendix.

Commission Meeting Discussions

The City Recreation Director met with the City Commission at their regular meetings in August and September 2023. The Director gave a brief overview of the project and planning process. The Commission focused discussions on priority capital projects as well as ballot language for the City's first parks and recreation millage. Additional detail is provided in the Basis For Action section and Appendix.

Action Program

The Action Program section of the document outlines the direction that the City would like to take over the next five years in order to maintain and improve recreation opportunities within the community. The Action Program includes goals and guidelines as well as a table of capital improvement priorities.

Public Hearing + Adoption

The draft Recreation Master Plan was made available for public review October 20, 2023 at the Cultural Center, City Hall, and City website. The public hearing was held in front of the City Commission on November 20, 2023. A brief overview of the purpose of the plan, process, and contents was presented.

The Plymouth City Commission adopted the Parks + Recreation Master Plan by resolution at their _____ meeting.



ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

This section of the Plan documents how parks and recreational activities and resources are governed and administered in the City of Plymouth. The functions of the various departments and staff with responsibility for recreation as well as budgetary expenditures and revenues are detailed.

Public Act 156 of 1917 (Local Government, Operate System of Public Recreation) authorizes cities, villages, counties, townships, and school districts to operate systems of public recreation and playgrounds. Section 1 of PA 156 of 1917 indicates that any city, village, county or township may:

1. Operate a system of public recreation and playgrounds;
2. Acquire equipment and maintain land, buildings, or other recreational facilities;
3. Employ a superintendent of recreation and assistants; and,
4. Vote to expend funds for the operation of such a system.

As is depicted in the organizational chart on the following page, the responsibility of managing, maintaining and improving recreation facilities within the City of Plymouth is primarily met by the Recreation Department as well as the Department of Municipal Services. However, the ultimate authority for the provision of parks and recreation in the City is held by the seven-member City Commission. As is described in Section 5.8 of the City Code, the Commission “shall provide for the public peace, health, and recreation, and for the safety of persons and property”. The City Commission is made up of seven residents who then elect a Mayor to lead the meetings and perform other ceremonial functions. Members of the City Commission may serve a maximum of three consecutive terms of office. City Commissioners are elected at large on a city-wide basis. The City Commission establishes the annual itemized budget for the recreation fund and generally oversees use of the budget. The Commission has the final say on large improvement projects, use of additional funds and land acquisitions. All decisions are based on recommendations from the City Manager, Recreation Director, and input from the public. Additionally, the Commission approves all grant applications and adopts the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

City Staff and Departments

The City of Plymouth Recreation Department falls under the purview of the City Manager and is responsible for a variety of tasks including:

- Program activities and organized sports offered by the City including facilitating enrollment and coordinating time and program locations
- Coordinate the use of multiple recreation facilities
- Provide referrals to volunteer sport organizations
- Recommend land, facility expansions and additional needs to the City Manager and City Commission
- Overseeing maintenance of recreational facilities with oversight from Municipal Services Department for the City Parks.
- Staffing and maintenance of the Cultural Center
- Overseeing and administering the City’s recreation fund

The Recreation Department includes four full-time staff (Recreation Director, Assistant Recreation Director, a Facility Manager, and Assistant Facility Manager) as well as a number of part time, seasonal and contractual staff.

Relationships with Other Agencies

The City has working relationships with a number of public and private agencies to assist in providing a variety of programming and additional outdoor space including:

- *Plymouth Community Arts Council (PCAC)*
The City partners with PCAC for children’s summer concert series in Kellogg Park.
- *Wayne County Parks*
Green space for soccer, t-ball; special events
- *Plymouth Canton Community Schools*
Green space for soccer and t-ball (with paid permit fee)
- *Miracle League of Plymouth*
Miracle League Field for t-ball games and practices
- *TDM (former Visteon)*
Green space for soccer
- *Plymouth Community Council on Aging (PCCA)*
A nonprofit organized to coordinate programs that promote and safeguard the independence and well-being of senior citizens of the greater Plymouth community. The PCCA is sponsored by Plymouth Township, City of Plymouth, Plymouth Department of Recreation, Plymouth Community United Way and Senior Alliance.
- *Plymouth Community United Way*
Funding for senior transportation, food distribution and other senior programs.

- *Plymouth Chamber of Commerce*
Marketing and special events
- *Plymouth Downtown Development Authority*
Oversees programming and special events in downtown Plymouth and Kellogg Park including Friday night Concert's.
- *Annual Festival Organizations*
Partner with the city and use city services to run and manage events including annual Ice Festival, Fall Festival, Art in the Park, etc.
- *Plymouth Garden Club*
Annual plantings at Veteran's Park and Garden Club Park
- *Rotary Club of Plymouth*
Plantings on Main Street at Kellogg Park

A number of schools, private organizations, leagues, etc. utilize City park properties and facilities (with various fees/rental agreements) including:

- Plymouth Canton Little League
- Assorted Travel Baseball Programs
- Plymouth Reign Soccer Club
- Plymouth Hockey Association
- Over 60 Hockey League
- Over 60 Hockey Drop-In Program
- Over 70 Hockey League
- Women's Flames Hockey Team
- Plymouth High School Varsity Hockey
- Plymouth Phantoms Travel Hockey
- Wayne Co Parks Special Events
- United Way Food Subsidies
- Noon Rotary Club of Plymouth
- Duplicate Bridge Program
- Party Bridge Program

Role of Volunteers

The City incorporates and relies on a number of volunteers to provide youth sports, some senior citizen programs, etc. By far, the majority of the volunteers are coaches, assistant coaches and team managers for the youth soccer program (80-100 adult volunteers per season). Youth t-ball has 30-40 adult

volunteers per season and senior citizen programs have 20-30 adult volunteers for programs throughout the year.

Fiscal Analysis


The provision of recreation within the City of Plymouth is funded through a variety of means. Revenues and expenditures over the past 6 years are summarized on the following pages to illustrate revenue and spending patterns related to parks and recreation in the City of Plymouth. Historically, the revenues generated from parks and recreation facilities and programming fall below the total recreation expenditures. The City supports parks and recreation through general fund dollars, as do many municipalities.

The City of Plymouth fiscal year begins July 1. From 2018-2024, both expenditures and revenues have remained fairly stable. The City funds parks and recreation primarily by the revenues generated from the various recreation facilities and programs and have been between \$1.18 - \$1.27 million per year. Revenues from hockey rentals and soccer are the two largest revenue generating programs. Contributions from the General Fund (listed under Administrative Charges) have varied between \$250,000 - \$500,000 each year since 2018. In terms of expenditures, Administration (salaries, equipment rental, repairs, maintenance, utilities, etc.) and the soccer program consume the majority of the recreation budget. Expenditures have ranged between \$900k (during the peak of COVID-19) and \$1.26 million budgeted for 2023/2024.

Over the past 6 years, the City has recovered between 55% - 79% of expenditures through revenue generation (not including grants, donations or transfers from the General Fund).

The National Recreation and Parks Association 2023 Agency Performance Review indicates that the typical Parks and Recreation Agency with a population less than 20,000 (as does the City) has 62% of their park and recreation operating expenditures derived from their general fund, 25% from earned revenue, 7% from dedicated levies, 1% from grants, 1% from sponsorships and 4% from other revenues.

City of Plymouth Recreation Department Organizational Chart



City of Plymouth
 Recreation Department
 Revenues + Expenditures 2018-2024

	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024
EXPENDITURES 2018-2023	actual	actual	actual	actual	actual	budgeted
Administration	\$ 857,270.64	\$ 872,508.00	\$ 801,405.67	\$ 894,934.81	\$ 965,112.81	\$ 1,084,755.00
Recreation Services & Vending	\$ 37,399.70	\$ 24,456.81	\$ 1,566.40	\$ 3,179.10	\$ 3,197.32	\$ 4,650.00
Basic Skills	\$ 5,900.22	\$ 9,545.08	\$ 6,865.56	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,500.00
Youth Athletics	\$ 3,910.99	\$ 1,426.67	\$ 7,324.19	\$ 4,582.39	\$ 4,466.71	\$ 10,000.00
Miracle League	\$ 12,250.00	\$ 11,085.00	\$ 11,190.00	\$ 8,775.00	\$ 8,235.00	\$ -
PCHA	\$ 25,172.82	\$ 13,936.45	\$ 12,824.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Mini Mites	\$ 3,672.35	\$ 3,035.65	\$ 1,633.37	\$ 3,327.24	\$ 421.18	\$ 6,740.00
MSD Services	\$ 4,930.05	\$ 11,999.33	\$ 11,386.60	\$ 7,560.93	\$ 4,472.77	\$ 118,150.00
Soccer	\$ 99,099.96	\$ 88,466.45	\$ 63,562.26	\$ 111,535.62	\$ 114,649.45	\$ 10,540.00
Liquor	\$ 2,373.90	\$ 3,896.64	\$ 1,332.37	\$ 4,983.47	\$ 9,718.42	\$ 14,150.00
Classes & Special Events	\$ 15,634.74	\$ 9,418.23	\$ 582.75	\$ 1,634.88	\$ 14,769.82	\$ 6,025.00
Senior Programs - Classes /TR	\$ 3,542.32	\$ 2,653.20	\$ -	\$ 3,584.46	\$ -	\$ -
Plymouth Canton Steelers	\$ 27,900.00	\$ 2,100.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TOTAL	\$ 1,099,057.69	\$ 1,054,527.51	\$ 919,673.17	\$ 1,044,097.90	\$ 1,128,488.72	\$ 1,260,510.00
REVENUES 2018-2023	actual	actual	actual	actual	actual	budgeted
Cultural Center	\$ 569,018.09	\$ 425,200.78	\$ 346,527.61	\$ 518,768.18	\$ 553,598.63	\$ 501,000.00
Administrative Charges	\$ 252,766.85	\$ 367,140.76	\$ 400,160.00	\$ 500,000.00	\$ 258,784.22	\$ 461,510.00
Program Fees & Charges	\$ 296,989.30	\$ 167,101.89	\$ 158,727.66	\$ 252,347.37	\$ 290,688.99	\$ 298,000.00
TOTAL	\$ 1,118,774.24	\$ 959,443.43	\$ 905,415.27	\$ 1,271,115.55	\$ 1,103,071.84	\$ 1,260,510.00
TOTAL REVENUES (ALL FUNDS)	\$ 1,118,774.24	\$ 959,443.43	\$ 905,415.27	\$ 1,271,115.55	\$ 1,103,071.84	\$ 1,260,510.00
TOTAL EXPENDITURES (ALL FUNDS)	\$ 1,099,057.69	\$ 1,054,527.51	\$ 919,673.17	\$ 1,044,097.90	\$ 1,128,488.72	\$ 1,260,510.00
NET	\$ 19,716.55	\$ 65,024.00	\$ 642,742.10	\$ 227,017.65	\$ (25,416.88)	\$ -

this page left intentionally blank



INVENTORY

Developing a complete inventory of recreation facilities, programs, and events is an essential component of a Recreation Master Plan. It provides a base of information to use in developing the Action Plan. Understanding what facilities, programs, and events are available to residents assists in future decision-making processes.

This portion of the Plan includes several components. The first component is a description of the recreation facilities and programs that the City of Plymouth owns and operates. Recreation, social and cultural facilities located within the City but owned and operated by outside agencies such as the public school district were also inventoried. A description of regional recreation facilities including those found within and just outside of the City are also summarized. The inventory includes an assessment of the barrier-free compliance status (using the MDNR guidelines) of City-owned park facilities. Lastly, this chapter includes a description of the facilities that were partially or completely acquired and/or developed using MDNR recreation grant funding.

City records show that Kellogg Park was a declared public park as early as 1867. The City slowly added to its supply of green spaces and public parks ever since. Plymouth's next addition to the parks was Hough Park dedicated in 1926. Plymouth continued its trend of investing in green spaces during the 1940's by purchasing the following parks: Auburn—Junction (Kiwanis Club Park); Burroughs-Coolidge (Lions Club Park); Holbrook-Caster (Louise Markham Park); Hamilton Playground (Fairground Park); Forest-Sutherland (Garden Club Park); and Wing-Herald Park (Rotary Club Park). The Elm St. Playground (Smith Park) was added in May of 1956.

The origin of the Adopt-A-Park Program began in the early 1980's when the City Recreation Department began approaching local service groups to help in the improvement of the valuable green spaces in the City. This led to the names of the parks in the City as they are more commonly known today.

The City of Plymouth Recreation Department offers a variety of programs for residents of the greater Plymouth Community. City of Plymouth residents contribute to the support of the City of Plymouth Recreation Department through property taxes, therefore, City of Plymouth residents are charged lesser rates for programs. An example of this would be that the Fall Soccer fees for WSSL age groups is \$171 for non-City residents and \$126 for City residents. All Cultural Center facility rentals are the same charge regardless of residency (per long-term property lease agreement with the school district).

A sampling of the recreation programs available include:

- Youth Hockey
- Over 60 Hockey
- Over 70 Hockey
- Tai Chi
- Youth Soccer
- T-Ball
- Cardio, Core and Fitness Classes
- Pilates
- Adult Yoga

- Senior Exercise
- Senior Bridge
- Senior Woodcarving
- Daddy Daughter Dance
- Kickboxing
- Trivia Night
- Euchre Tournaments
- Cornhole Leagues
- Pickleball Leagues
- Citizens Academy
- Seminars
- Special Events

In addition to the above programs, many others are also available depending on the time of year, as the City's programs change for each of the four seasons. These programs and classes are available to all citizens in the City of Plymouth in addition to citizens living in the greater Plymouth Community. Programs, activities, and classes are provided for all ages. Most of the recreation programs and activities are held at City facilities such as the Cultural Center, but others, such as the youth soccer program, utilizes several area soccer fields both in and outside of the City.

The City of Plymouth also will partner with the Plymouth Community Council on Aging (PCCA) to provide social and recreation activities to seniors in the community. The PCCA offices are at the Plymouth Township Hall and the Township Friendship Station building is utilized by the PCCA who organizes and offers programs such as line dancing, cardio exercise, yoga, chair exercise, bingo, knitting, cards, lunches, and a variety of talks on subjects such as elder care, diabetes, etc. Day trips are also organized to a variety of restaurants and activities throughout metro Detroit.

The City also contributes funds to the Plymouth Community Senior Transportation program (shared funding with the Township) that operates out of the Township's Friendship Station. The program provides rides to residents 60 years old and older within and around the Plymouth community for a nominal fee.

The City-owned parks were inventoried in June/July 2023 with findings documented on

the following pages. The City of Plymouth owns 17 public park and recreation facilities that encompass approximately 22 acres of land including the Plymouth Community Cultural Center and Ice Arena. In addition, residents of the City are served by several properties owned by the school district, Wayne County, Plymouth Township, as well as private and/or non-profit recreation providers.

An inventory table has been developed that lists the various parks and recreation facilities in the City and the various amenities found at each park. In addition, narrative summaries for each City-owned park have been developed. An Inventory Map illustrates the location of each park and facility.

City of Plymouth Grant History

When preparing a 5-year Parks and Recreation Plan, the Michigan Department of Natural Resources requires that information be provided concerning grants that have been received in the past for acquisition or development of recreation facilities. In the past, the City has received two grants for recreation facility development. A brief assessment of each project is noted and the most recent Post-Completion Self Certification Report PR1944 are provided in the Appendix.

CITY OF PLYMOUTH MDNR GRANT HISTORY

Grant Title:
Tonquish Creek Neighborhood Park
(1967)

Grant Number: 26-00087

Grant Amount: \$8,632.50

Scope Items: Acquisition of four parcels of land totaling 1.72 acres for development of neighborhood park

Current Status: Property remains as public outdoor recreation as a passive park with open space and walking trail.

Grant Title:
Plymouth Cultural Center Renovations
(2000)

Grant Number: CM00-289

Grant Amount: \$634,983

Scope Items: Dasher board system replacement, lighting, energy reduction system for lighting and refrigerations, exit signage, 2 locker room addition, zamboni storage room addition.

Current Status: Facility remains available for public use. All scope items were installed and remain active.

**Barrier Free Status of Parks
(MDNR Rating)**

With the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), all areas of public service and accommodation became subject to barrier-free requirements, including parks and recreation facilities and programs. Each City park summary sheet included in this chapter notes an accessibility ranking (as defined and required by the MDNR) for the park. Ratings are for planning purposes only.


Each facility was given a rating of 1 through 5 (MDNR rating) with the following definitions:

1. None of the facilities/park areas meet guidelines
2. Some of the facilities/park areas meet guidelines
3. Most of the facilities/park areas meet guidelines
4. Entire park meets guidelines
5. Entire park was developed/renovated using principals of universal design

The barrier free status rating can change as ADA improvements are implemented over time.


In 2004, the federal Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board (known as the Access Board) issued updated guidelines, entitled the Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG), for new or altered facilities covered by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-336) or the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-480).

The ADAAG guidelines should be referred to when designing new or renovating parks and recreation facilities.



- | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|---|--------------------|
|  | City of Plymouth Parks |  | Major Roads |
|  | Plymouth Township Parks |  | Other Roads |
|  | Schools Property |  | Railroad |
|  | County Parks |  | Rivers and Streams |
|  | Other Facilities |  | Municipal Boundary |
|  | Nonmotorized Trails | | |

Recreation Inventory Source:
Inventory conducted by L Groya Consulting, June 2023



PARK INVENTORY MAP
CITY OF PLYMOUTH
PARKS & RECREATION
MASTER PLAN
2024 - 2028

PLYMOUTH COMMUNITY CULTURAL CENTER + ICE ARENA

Size: 4.23 acres
MDNR Accessibility Rating: 4

The Plymouth Community Cultural Center is the City's only indoor recreation facility, located on 4.23 acres north of the privately held Plymouth Arts and Recreation Center (PARC). The Plymouth Cultural Center offers a wide variety of recreation opportunities including the NHL-sized geo-thermal Ice Arena used by organized hockey leagues and teams as well as for figure skating and open skating. When the ice is removed for the summer, the city converts the space to 5 pickleball courts for leagues and drop-in play. Related facilities include a concession stand, zamboni storage garage, equipment rooms, ADA accessible bleachers, and an ADA accessible viewing area. In 2023, the original 1972 locker rooms were completely reconfigured and renovated to meet ADA requirements and allow for multi-gender teams and referees.

The facility includes a geothermal based ice refrigeration plant and heat reclamation system (2010), as well as meeting and banquet rooms that were updated with new carpet and paint (2023). The large banquet room can accommodate up to 160 people and includes a stage. Meeting rooms that accommodate up to 50 people are also available for smaller meetings and seminars. The banquet and meeting rooms are complimented by full kitchen facilities. All 4 restrooms were updated to meet ADA standards (2022). At regular times throughout the year, the Cultural Center's meeting rooms are utilized by the Rotary Club of Plymouth, Plymouth Community Council on Aging, Plymouth Hockey Association, Western Suburban Soccer League, and various recreation classes.

Other features at the Cultural Center include lounge areas, vending machines, outdoor picnic tables, outdoor benches, and a bike rack. Recreation Department offices are also located within the building.



KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS PARK

Size: 0.5 acres
MDNR Accessibility Rating: 4

Knights of Columbus Park is a one-half acre neighborhood park located at the corner of Spring Street and Holbrook Avenue in the northeastern portion of the City. The primary recreation facilities at the Knights of Columbus Park include a playground, swings, and a picnic shelter. The park also has two picnic tables, a bike rack, trash receptacles, a pollinator garden, and brick pathways.



DON MASSEY FIELD

Size: 2.8 acres

MDNR Accessibility Rating: 4

This community park is located on Plymouth Road in the eastern portion of the City. Don Massey Field is on approximately 2.8-acres on the east side of the City adjacent to the 35th District Court and Riverside Cemetery. The City's largest baseball/softball field accounts for the sole recreation facility and the majority of the property at the park. The outfield is used for U-5/U-8 soccer fields. The baseball/softball field features a two-story press box building, batting cage, bleachers, covered dugouts, electronic scoreboard, outdoor lighting and a drinking fountain. Additionally, a paved parking area serves the park.




FAIRGROUND PARK

Size: 2.52 acres

MDNR Accessibility Rating: 2

Fairground Park accommodates a variety of recreation facilities including a sand volleyball court, a basketball hoop with concrete playing area (renovated in 2022 with a number of donations), a playground, a practice baseball field and a soccer field. The soccer field and baseball field are not regulation size and share the same undefined playing area in the eastern half of the park. A hill is used for sledding by small children in the northern portion of the park. Additional amenities at the park include picnic tables, drinking fountain, trash receptacles and outdoor lighting. The Fairground Park Association donates money toward improvements and assists with clean up.




GARDEN CLUB PARK

Size: 0.66 acres

MDNR Accessibility Rating: 3

Garden Club Park is located on a 0.66-acre parcel along Forest Avenue between Carol and Sutherland Avenues. This neighborhood park provides recreation opportunities for the residents in the southwestern portion of the City of Plymouth.

Although it is a small park, several recreation facilities are found including one small softball backstop (12 and under), a mini soccer field with two small goals, a playground and a picnic shelter. In addition to the primary facilities, the park features benches, a bike rack, tire swing, swing set, picnic tables, a grill, drinking fountain and trash receptacles. The park is also served by outdoor lighting.



KIWANIS CLUB PARK

Size: 0.77 acres

MDNR Accessibility Rating: 3

Kiwanis Club Park is a small neighborhood park found in the City's northwest corner. The 0.77-acre park is located along the east side of Auburn Avenue between Junction Avenue and Farmer Street.

Facilities at the park include a practice ball backstop for small children and two soccer goals (not a full soccer field). There is a picnic pavilion with 4 picnic tables and 2 grills as well as a large play structure, smaller play structure, and swings. Additional park amenities include benches, bike rack, drinking fountain, dog waste station, and trash receptacles.




SMITH PARK

Size: 0.37 acres
MDNR Accessibility Rating: 4

Smith Park (0.37-acres) is located at the end of Elm Avenue, near Sheldon Road along the western edge of the City. Although the main access to the park is from Elm Avenue, pedestrians can access the park from the Sheldon Road side.

Smith Park features a playground area with a swing set, slide and other play pieces. A shelter with two picnic tables is another main feature at the park and is popular during summer months. Park benches, drinking fountain (people and dogs), dog waste station and trash receptacles are additional amenities.



ROTARY CLUB PARK

Size: 0.71 acres
MDNR Accessibility Rating: 4

Classified as a neighborhood park, Rotary Club Park occupies 0.71 acres of land at the intersection of Wing Street and Herald Street, southwest of downtown.

Rotary Club Park includes open space areas as well as a playground and a shelter with two picnic tables. Additional facilities at the park include benches, dog waste station, little free library, drinking fountain, and trash receptacles.



JACK WILCOX PARK

Size: 0.28 acres

MDNR Accessibility Rating: 4

Jack Wilcox Park is a 0.28-acre park in the southern portion of the City at the corner of Dewey Avenue and Byron Avenue. This park features several recreation amenities including two playground structures and a shelter. Other features include benches, 4 picnic tables, a drinking fountain (people and dogs), dog waste station and brick pathways.





KELLOGG PARK

Size: 1.14 acres

MDNR Accessibility Rating: 4

With its central location in the heart of Downtown Plymouth, Kellogg Park is one of the City's most visible and busiest parks and community spaces. Kellogg Park includes a central water feature (renovated in 2021), drinking fountains, benches, trash receptacles and brick walkways. The park is most commonly utilized for gathering, eating, people watching, and a resting spot for visitors and patrons of Plymouth's Central Business District. Many festivals and events are held at the park throughout the year including Art in the Park, Plymouth Fall Festival, Plymouth Ice Festival, Music in the Park Concerts, as well as private weddings.



LOUISE MARKHAM PARK

Size: 0.42 acres

MDNR Accessibility Rating: 4

Louise Markham Park (formerly Caster Park) is located near the corner of Farmer Street and Holbrook Avenue in the northeastern portion of the City.

This 0.42 acre mini-park includes a gazebo, benches and walkways connecting to Holbrook Street and the Starkweather Lofts. The property was given to the City in 1940 by Louise Markham who had lived in Plymouth most of her life. She gave it to the City in order to protect it from becoming a gravel pit and for use as a municipal park. In 2016, the Starkweather Lofts apartment developers added the gazebo and pathway as part of a public benefit agreement.




Photo: Pete Mundt

LION'S CLUB PARK

Size: 2.15 acres
MDNR Accessibility Rating: 4

Lions Club Park is a 2.15-acre neighborhood park located along Burroughs Avenue between Coolidge Street and Harding Avenue in the southeastern corner of Plymouth.

Lion's Club Park is comprised of two segments, divided by Burroughs Avenue. The parkland on the north side of Burroughs Avenue is maintained as natural open space along Tonquish Creek with two benches and a pollinator garden. The park's active recreation facilities are found on the south side of Burroughs Avenue including a large shelter with picnic tables, a playground area, grills, swing sets, benches, dog waste station, trash receptacles and outdoor lighting.




POINT PARK

Size: 0.67 acres

MDNR Accessibility Rating: 3

Point Park is a triangle shaped open space located in the northern portion of the City near Wilcox Lake at Starkweather Avenue and Mill Street. Point Park serves as an entryway to the northern portion of the City from Plymouth Township. Point Park does not include active recreation facilities. The park includes a flag pole, benches, picnic tables, paved walkways and outdoor lighting.




STARKWEATHER PARK

Size: 0.24 acres

MDNR Accessibility Rating: 4



Starkweather Park is a small, 0.24-acre park on the north side of Farmer Avenue between Starkweather Avenue and Mill Street in the northeastern corner of Plymouth. Facilities in the park include a gazebo, benches, dog waste station, landscaping beds, trash receptacles, brick walkways and outdoor lighting. The park is sometimes used as a location for private weddings.



VETERAN'S MEMORIAL PARK

Size: 0.75 acres
MDNR Accessibility Rating: 4

Veteran's Memorial Park is located at the intersection of Main Street and Church Street, just south of the PARC facility in the center of Plymouth. The park includes open space, paved sidewalks and landscaping features. The park also features long-standing stone walls at its entrances and perimeter. The centerpiece of the park is the memorial plaza with a number of war memorials, flags and monuments. The park was privately funded by a conglomerate of veterans groups and multiple fundraising efforts. In addition, the local Veterans group established a park trust fund derived from the sale of a house located on Main Street in downtown Plymouth that was previously used for veteran's programs.





HOUGH PARK

Size: 1.95 acres

MDNR Accessibility Rating: N/A

Hough Park is a 1.95 acre park located between Maple Avenue and Park Place in the western portion of the City. The park is undeveloped open space with significant trees and natural areas. The park has dog waste station and is utilized mainly by the neighboring residents for passive recreational purposes.




TONQUISH CREEK PARK

Size: 1.72 acres

MDNR Accessibility Rating: 3

MDNR Grant: 26-00087 (1967)

Tonquish Creek Park is a 1.72-acre open space and walking trail that is located north of Sheridan Street and connects to Harvey Street in the western portion of the City. The park is undeveloped open space/natural area with an informal walking trail, extensive trees, benches, lamp posts and natural areas. The Tonquish Creek (a tributary to the Rouge River) runs through the property. The property is utilized for passive recreational purposes such as nature walks.



Plymouth Township Facilities

Plymouth Township surrounds the City of Plymouth owns 7 public park and recreation facilities totaling approximately 176 acres of land including the 70-acre Plymouth Township Park and the 86-acre Hilltop Golf Course. The Township Park includes shelters, walking paths, nature trail, playgrounds, fishing pond, baseball diamonds, sledding hill and a spray park.

Public School Facilities

The Plymouth-Canton Community School District owns and operates 2 properties in the City of Plymouth. This includes East Middle School and Smith Elementary School. Facilities at each school property are detailed on the Inventory Table.

Hines Park - Wayne County Facilities

In terms of total acreage, Wayne County's Hines Park (2300 acres) is the largest recreation facility comprising approximately 60 acres in the City. The park encompasses the properties along both sides of Edward Hines Drive as it traverses through the City of Plymouth and the eastern portion of Plymouth Township. The segment of Hines Park within Plymouth is part a larger linear park and trail system operated by Wayne County Parks that stretches 17.5 miles along Hines Drive and the Rouge River from Northville to Dearborn, connecting communities in between. The linear parkway consists of undeveloped natural open spaces along Hines Drive with developed recreation areas and parking areas at points within the parkway. Each of these recreation areas are given a separate name. Within Plymouth and Plymouth Township, four such facilities within Hines Park are found:

Wilcox Lake Recreation Area

This area within Hines Park is found on the north side of Wilcox Lake in Plymouth Township. The Wilcox Picnic Area is located on Wilcox Lake. It features a small shelter, play equipment and fishing docks. Wilcox Lake is one of four impoundments built along the middle branch of the Rouge River by settlers in the 1800's to power a mill. The old Hardenberg Gristmill was built around 1850

and powered from the dam on Wilcox Lake, fostering the growth of a settlement that became the City of Plymouth. The historic mill was purchased by Henry Ford in 1922 and converted into a Village Industry Plant that produced taps (device used to manufacture screws). This cottage industry plant became an important manufacturer of small parts for the Pratt and Whitney airplane engine during World War II. The mill was given to the Wayne County Park Trustees by Ford Motor Company for incorporation into Hines Park in 1949.

Gunsolly Mills Recreation Area

This recreation area is found along Hines Drive between Wilcox Road and Plymouth Road. Formally the home of a carding mill frequented by Henry Ford and his family to have their wool carded (carding cleans, separates, and straightens the wool fibers, producing lofty wool ready for spinning into yarn). This site now houses a picnic shelter with a children's play structure and a radio car race track that is open during daylight hours.

Plymouth Riverside Recreation Area

This area is located within the City of Plymouth along the banks of the Middle Rouge River. One of the oldest picnic areas in Hines Park, this scenic area offers a combination of facilities and settings. The historic comfort station is architecturally significant and ADA accessible. Patterned after a train station, this structure was built in 1926 and is complemented with a picnic shelter and a play structure.

Haggerty Recreation Area

This recreation area within Hines Park is found along Hines Drive southeast of the City of Plymouth. This area has two soccer fields, two ball diamonds, and a Tudor-style comfort station. This area is utilized for sport activities and is home to the First Responders Memorial.

Regional Nonmotorized Trails

Two regionally significant nonmotorized trails travel through the Plymouth community, the 275 Metro Trail and the Hines Drive Bike Path. The 275 Metro Trail began back in the 1970s as the Michigan Department of

Transportation's response to the then-fuel crisis. Significant improvements have taken place over the past 10 years with the paved trail running from Novi in the north to New Boston in the south. The Friends of the 275 Metro Trail is an active group of volunteers that advocate and assist with clean up activities.

The Hines Bike Path is 17.5 miles long within Hines Park and traversing along Hines Drive. A portion of the Hines Drive Bike Path helps to connect the northern and southern sections of the 275 Metro Trail. The Hines Bike Path and 275 Metro Trail connect to and provide access to numerous miles of other regional trail corridors in metropolitan Detroit.

Other Recreation Facilities/Offerings

There are other private and/or non-profit entities within the Plymouth community that can assist in providing diverse and comprehensive recreation opportunities to the community. In addition to those described here there are a number of fitness studios/gyms in the Plymouth community.

St. John's Resort

St. John's Resort is located along Sheldon Road in Plymouth Township. This 184-acre property includes an 18-hole PGA Championship golf course, 7-hole par 3 course, clubhouse building, pro shop, indoor golf range, hotel, restaurants, chapel and wedding and conference center.

Plymouth Arts & Recreation Complex (PARC)

The non-profit PARC is located at the PARC complex (former Central Middle School) in downtown Plymouth. Their mission is to enrich lives through quality arts, education and recreation programs for all ages. PARC signed a Purchase Agreement in 2015 to



purchase the property from the Plymouth-Canton School District with private funds. PARC serves as the landlord of the facility and houses a number tenants that run a variety of programs such as theater productions, youth sports, culinary arts classes, orchestra concerts and arts education. Tenants range from the Michigan Philharmonic to the Friends of the Rouge. The existing PARC facility also includes a swimming pool, gymnasium, tennis courts, and outdoor athletic fields.

Bilkie Family – Miracle Field

The Miracle League of Plymouth is a nonprofit organization dedicated to providing children with physical and mental disabilities an opportunity to play organized baseball.

The league is non-competitive, with all players getting to bat and circle the bases each inning.

The Miracle League is for 5 and older with a Spring and Fall season. The Plymouth

T-ball league uses the Bilkie Family Miracle League field for their programs. The City manages the Miracle League registration and janitorial services in exchange for using the field for T-ball.



USA Hockey Arena

The 25-acre USA Hockey Arena site is located on Beck Road in Plymouth Township. The multi-purpose ice sports facility is home to the USA Hockey's National Team Development Program. In addition, summer camps, open skate, and learn to skate/play programs are offered. The facility includes a restaurant/brewery and can also accommodate special events such as music concerts, trade shows and graduation commencements.

Victory Ice Center

The Victory Ice Center is located east of the City on Plymouth Road in Plymouth Township. The facility is home to the Victory Honda AAA Hockey Club and Salem High School Hockey. The Arena was rebuilt in 2017/2018 and includes a pro shop, concession stand, and locker rooms.

Western Wayne County Conservation Association

The Western Wayne County Conservation Association operates an approximately 80-acre parcel in the western portion of Plymouth Township. The association is a sportsman’s club created to promote the conservation of natural resources and wildlife in Michigan. The property includes a clubhouse building and a number of outdoor shooting/archery ranges.

TDM Soccer Fields

Two irrigated soccer fields (11v11) were built by the City in 1993 on TDM property (just north of M-14). The fields are maintained by the City with TDM providing water and electric. TDMs adult teams utilize the fields on Monday and Thursday evenings and Sundays.

Plymouth Community Arts Council (PCAC)

The Plymouth Community Arts Council (PCAC) was founded in 1969 to provide quality fine and performing arts, and cultural opportunities to the greater Western Wayne County community. Programs and activities focus on ensuring accessibility to all the arts by all ages. The PCAC’s mission is to develop and to promote the appreciation and accessibility of the Arts for everyone in the greater community and in doing so, encourage and foster artistic excellence.

The PCAC complex on Sheldon Road includes the Joanne Winkleman Hulce Center for the Arts and the Artsco House directly adjacent for artist studios, media center, additional classroom space and program offices. The PCAC complex provides arts education classes, a theater program, concerts, lectures & seminars, recitals, workshops, artist studio space, community-based enrichment activities & private rentals.

Plymouth YMCA

The YMCA operates out of the PARC facility and partners with other organizations to provide programs and services throughout the Plymouth/Canton area.

Significant Facilities Outside of Plymouth

Plymouth-Canton Educational Park

Commonly known as PCEP or “The Park”, the 305-acre campus in just south of Plymouth Township and includes three public secondary schools – Salem High School, Canton High School, and Plymouth High School. Facilities include swimming pools, performing arts auditorium, gymnasiums, an 8,000-seat football and field events stadium, two tracks, nature trail, numerous baseball and softball fields, soccer fields and tennis courts.

Maybury State Park

The MDNR’s Maybury State Park is just north of Plymouth in Northville Township and contains almost 1,000 acres of gently rolling terrain, open meadow, mature forest, and a variety of wildlife and abundant wildflowers. The park includes numerous trail for hiking, biking, mountain biking, and cross-country skiing. Maybury also includes picnic areas, shelters, playground, restrooms, riding stables, a fishing pond, baseball fields, and soccer fields.





BASIS FOR ACTION



This section of the Plan is intended to further analyze a variety of factors within and outside the City of Plymouth that may have an affect on recreation trends and/or planned improvements over the next five years. This chapter provides the rationale for the goals, objectives, and desired capital improvements. This rationale is based on analysis and consideration of many elements including: current recreation trends, comparison of parks to national benchmarks, service area gaps, demographic trends, existing plans, and results of community and staff input. It should be noted that each piece of information and analysis contained within this section must be considered as one piece of the puzzle and as one piece of the whole bigger picture. Each of the factors discussed contributes to the determination of need.

Recreation Trends

Recreation trends occurring nationally may provide insight into activities that can be expected to draw a large number of participants and activities that have shown the greatest growth in popularity. The Physical Activity Council published a 2023 Participation Report tracking sports, fitness, and recreation participation in the US. The data was collected via 18,000 online interviews in 2022.

Sports and activities are grouped into 1 of 7 categories: Fitness Sports, Individual Sports, Outdoor Sports, Racquet Sports, Team Sports, Water Sports and Winter Sports. Most categories showed a moderate increase in participation from 2017 to 2022.

Outdoor Sports (such as bicycling, hiking, fishing, running, skiing) had the most gain, increasing 6% over the six-year period. Individual Sports (such as bowling, hunting, roller skating, golf) saw the greatest loss with a nearly 5% decrease over the same 6-year period. Racquet Sports (such as tennis, pickleball, table tennis) gained popularity with a 3.1% increase in participation. Fitness sports/activities (such as dance, pilates, jogging, walking for fitness, aquatics, stair-climbing, weights) increased by 1.9%.



National Benchmarks

An additional planning tool available for parks and recreation agencies is the 2023 National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) Agency Performance Review. The review provides for valuable benchmarks and insights that help:

- guide professionals in the evaluation of performance of their agencies
- make informed decisions on the optimal set of service and facility offerings based on demographics while also providing comparative agency data from other communities/agencies
- show prevalence of expanded activities and offerings of agencies throughout the nation

Data is a valuable tool but not the final answer in terms of decision-making. This benchmarking data and metrics can be used as a piece of the overall conversation as the City moves forward. The 2023 NRPA report contains data 1,000+ park and recreation agencies across the United States as reported between 2020 and 2022. Additional data (by size of jurisdiction) was pulled from interactive tables at www.nrpa.org website.


The data on the following pages highlights metrics for the typical park and recreation agency with a population of less than 20,000 (as is the case for the City of Plymouth). A comparison of City of Plymouth data is provided based on the most recent inventory and latest expenditure and revenue data. This data and comparison is intended to continue to inform the Action Plan and discussions over the next 5 years. Every agency and community needs are different.

A table is also included to benchmark the current facility offerings in the City to other jurisdictions in the United States with similar populations. Details regarding size, condition, etc. are not considered and comparison data is available for only a limited number of facility types. Indoor and outdoor facilities owned by other public, quasi-public, or private entities can assist in providing many of the compared facility types (i.e. Wayne County, School District, Township, PARC, etc.),

however, those are not under the control of the City in terms of use, scheduling, maintenance and/or improvements.

When comparing typical agencies in the same population range as Plymouth, the City falls below the benchmark for compared outdoor facility types with the exception of playgrounds. The City has 1 playground for every 1,171 residents as compared to the benchmark of 1 for every 2,014 people.

The comparison for Indoor Facilities is a bit more challenging as the benchmark data includes individual figures for Recreation Centers, Community Centers, Senior Centers, etc. It is difficult to fully understand exactly what size these facilities may be or what types of offerings may or may not be included in each of these category types.



The Typical Park + Recreation Agency (population less than 20,000)	City of Plymouth (population 9,370) US Census 2020
1 Park for every 1,225 residents	1 Park for every 551 residents
13.0 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents	2.43 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents
\$1,200,000 annual operating expenditures (median)	\$1.084 M annual operating expenditures (median last 6 yrs)
\$2M budgeted over next 5 years for capital expenditures	Contingent upon outcome of November 2023 millage
Recovers 26% of operating expenditures through revenue generation (not including grants)	Recovers 55% - 79% of operating expenditures through revenue generation (not including grants past 6 years)
11.3 FTEs (full-time equivalents) (mix of full-time and part-time employees)	10 FTEs (full-time equivalents) (mix of full-time and part-time employees does not include contractual or seasonals)

Source: 2023 NRPA Agency Performance Review

City of Plymouth Facilities Comparison

Bench Marked to 2023 NPRA Agency

City of Plymouth Population 9,370 (2020 Census)

OUTDOOR FACILITIES

	City of Plymouth		
	Number of Residents Per Facility Benchmark	Number of Facilities Owned by City of Plymouth	Number of Residents Per Facility Owned by City of Plymouth
Playgrounds	2,014	8	1,171
Basketball Courts	3,729	1 (a)	9,370
Dog Park	11,100	0	N/A
Community Gardens	8,178	0	N/A
Tennis Courts	2,805	0	N/A
Pickleball Courts	3,252	0	N/A
Diamond Fields: baseball-youth	3,114	1 (b)	9,370
Diamond Fields: baseball - adult	7,627	0	N/A
Diamond Fields: softball fields - adult	5,800	0	N/A
Diamond Fields: softball fields - youth	5,079	0	N/A
Rectangular Fields: soccer field	3,600	0	N/A
Rectangular Fields: football field	8,637	0	N/A
Rectangular Fields: lacrosse field	9,786	0	N/A
Rectangular Fields: field hockey	18,000	0	N/A
Multiuse courts - basketball,volleyball	5,093	0	N/A
Multipurpose synthetic field	9,518	0	N/A

Does not consider condition.

(a) 1 hoop in Fairground Park.

(b) Don Massey Field plus 3 practice fields

City of Plymouth Facilities Comparison

Bench Marked to 2023 NPRA Agency

City of Plymouth Population 9,370 (2020 Census)

INDOOR FACILITIES

	City of Plymouth		
	Number of Residents Per Facility Benchmark	Number of Facilities Owned by City of Plymouth	Number of Residents Per Facility Owned by City of Plymouth
Recreation Centers (including gyms)	9,745	1 (d)	9,370
Community Centers	8,829	0	N/A
Senior Centers	14,000	0	N/A
Performance Amphitheater	11,100	0	N/A
Nature Centers	10,633	0	N/A
Ice Rink (Indoor)	8,000	1	9,370
Teen Centers	14,593	0	N/A

(d) Cultural Center includes program, meeting and banquet space

Source: 2023 NPRA Agency Performance Review

10-Minute Walk to Park

The 10-Minute Walk program is an advocacy campaign launched by The Trust for Public Land, National Recreation and Park Association, Urban Land Institute, and supported by the US Conference of Mayors, establishing the goal that all Americans should live within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) of a high-quality park or green space. As noted in the campaign, studies show that high-quality parks provide a wide range of benefits to urban residents and cities themselves. These include:

- physical and mental health benefits, by providing opportunities to be physically active and to interact with nature
- economic benefits by boosting business and helping to revitalize neighborhoods
- community-building benefits by providing opportunities for neighbors to interact with each other and work together to improve their surroundings
- environmental benefits by cleaning and cooling the air and providing opportunities for environmental education

To illustrate the proximity of recreation areas to residents, a map has been created that shows residents of the City of Plymouth all have a publicly-owned green space within a 10-minute walk (1/2 mile) of their home. School and privately-owned facilities have not been included due to their lack of availability and/or control by the municipalities. Nuances of this analysis can be argued – i.e. Point Park currently serves more as a gateway to the community as opposed to a traditional park and school properties, open spaces within neighborhoods and private recreation related properties can and do provide some recreation benefits to residents of the community.

Community Demographics

The socioeconomic characteristics of a community also play a role in the demand for certain types of recreation facilities. By examining socioeconomic characteristics such

as population density, age, and household size, municipalities can identify trends and opportunities that may influence future land use and recreation decisions and/or policy choices. This section provides a brief summary of a handful of socioeconomic characteristics of the City that may (along with a number of other pieces of data and information) influence parks and recreation planning decisions.

The US Census as well as the SEMCOG website community profiles (US Census Bureau and American Community Survey) serves as the primary source of data for this demographics section. Census/ACS statistics are presented for the City in comparison to the County and State. In addition, a series of maps are included that illustrate a few relevant pieces of Census data by block group within the City.


Population Trends and Forecast









Between 1980 and 2020, the City experienced a 6.2% decline in population, but has been stable and moderately rising since 2000. In 2010, the population was 9,132 and in 2020, 9,370 people resided in the City. The population is forecasted to remain relatively stable over the next 20 years.


Population by Block Group

Population and population density characteristics can have an influence on parks and recreation planning. Where population is most dense, there is typically a greater need for park facilities. Conversely, it may not be as practical or economical to locate park facilities within sparsely populated areas.

The Population Density by Block Group Map illustrates the number of people living within the City by block group (as defined by the US Census). The most dense portion of the City are those areas west of the railroad tracks, and generally west of Main Street.



-  10-Minute Walk to Park (one-half mile)
-  City of Plymouth Parks
-  County Parks
-  Major Roads
-  Other Roads
-  Railroad
-  Rivers and Streams
-  Municipal Boundary



10-MINUTE WALK TO PARK MAP
CITY OF PLYMOUTH
PARKS & RECREATION
MASTER PLAN
2024 - 2028

Median Age

Knowledge of a community’s age distribution can also play a role in the planning of park facilities and programs. Whether an area is comprised of older or younger citizens can influence such things as the facilities that are most desired within parks. The Median Age by Block Group Map shows the median age for the block groups within the City. The Block Group with the highest median age is in the southern section between Lilley and Main and south of Ann Arbor Trail. The Old Village area has the lowest median age.

Household Size


A household, as defined by the US Census, is all persons who occupy the same housing unit. A housing unit can be described as a house, apartment, mobile home, a group of rooms, or a single room used as a separate living quarters. A characteristic of today’s population is the declining size of households. There are several factors that demographers have linked to the declining size. People are marrying later, postponing having children, and having fewer children. The number of single parent households is increasing, thus contributing to the decline in average household size. Household size is another factor that may be of interest when making recreation facility and program decisions. A high person per household figure can be an indication that an area is comprised of families with children and thus could justify family or youth-oriented recreation facilities. Conversely, an area with a low person per household figure may require recreation facilities more favorable to singles, adults or the elderly.

The geographic distribution of household size in the City is portrayed on the Average Household Size by Block Group Map. The highest average household sizes are found west of the railroad tracks (which correlates to the population density map), with the block group in the northwest section of the City having the highest average household size.


*Demographic Comparisons
US Census 2020 +
SEMCOG Community Profiles*

- City
- Twp
- County
- SE Mich (SEMCOG)

Average Household Size




Median Age




Percent Over 65 years



Percent Under 18 years




Percent Bachelors Degree or Higher



Median Household Income (2021 dollars)







CENSUS DATA LEGEND
Population Density by Block Group
(people/sq. mile)

- 2,500 TO 2,900
- 3,000 TO 3,499
- 3,500 TO 3,999
- 4,000 TO 4,499
- 4,500 TO 5,000

- Major Roads
- Other Roads
- Railroad
- Rivers and Streams
- Municipal Boundary
- Block Group Boundary
- 5627.1** Block Group I.D.




POPULATION DENSITY MAP
CITY OF PLYMOUTH
PARKS & RECREATION
MASTER PLAN
2024 - 2028




CENSUS DATA LEGEND
Median Age by Block Group

- 34.9 OR LESS
- 35.0 TO 39.9
- 40.0 TO 44.9
- 45.0 TO 49.9
- 50.0 OR MORE

- Major Roads
- Other Roads
- Railroad
- Rivers and Streams
- Municipal Boundary
- Block Group Boundary
- 5627.1** Block Group I.D.




MEDIAN AGE MAP
CITY OF PLYMOUTH
PARKS & RECREATION
MASTER PLAN
2024 - 2028



CENSUS DATA LEGEND
Average Household Size by Block Group

- 1.74 AND LESS
- 1.75 TO 1.99
- 2.00 TO 2.24
- 2.25 TO 2.49
- 2.50 AND ABOVE

- Major Roads
- Other Roads
- Railroad
- Rivers and Streams
- Municipal Boundary
- Block Group Boundary
- 5627.1** Block Group I.D.



AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE MAP
CITY OF PLYMOUTH
PARKS & RECREATION
MASTER PLAN
2024 - 2028

Influencing Planning Initiatives

It is important to examine plans that have been developed by the City, Township, or other agencies over the past several years that may affect and/or influence the existing or future recreation areas and facilities in the Plymouth Community. A description of these is provided on the following pages.

SEMCOG Parks and Recreation Master Plan (2019)


The SEMCOG Parks and Recreation Master Plan focuses on enhancing the region’s recreation system and builds on recommendations from other existing regional plans and policies. The Plan contains the following six regional policies:

- Integrate community health and wellness initiatives with outdoor recreation opportunities
- Ensure equitable access to recreation opportunities for people of all backgrounds, ages, and abilities in SE Michigan
- Promote the economic value of parks and recreation
- Support conservation and stewardship in balance with recreation opportunities
- Raise awareness among residents and visitors
- Foster collaboration among stakeholders


Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan for Southeast Michigan (SEMCOG 2020)

SEMCOG and MDOT worked together to develop a Bicycle and Pedestrian Mobility Plan for the SE Michigan Region to establish a common vision for bicycling and walking in the region, and provide guidance on how to increase the connectivity, use, and safety of the system for all residents. To continue enhancing the system and meet the needs of the region, the plan recommends the following regional policies:

- Connect and expand the network
- Ensure equitable access
- Increase safety



Walking and Biking Trip Purposes in Southeast Michigan (SEMCOG)



- Promote healthy lifestyles and vibrant communities
- Provide education
- Ensure sustainability

Wayne County Parks and Recreation Plan

Wayne County Parks also developed a new 5-Year Plan in 2022/23. The plan includes updated goals, objectives, and capital improvement priorities. In addition to recent improvements along the Hines Park system, for the Plymouth area, the plan calls for parking improvements at the Recreation Areas as well as significant funding for Wilcox Lake for dredging, habitat restoration, and various amenities.

Wayne County Connecting the Rouge

Connecting the Rouge is a regional planning effort initiated by Wayne County Parks. It is an effort to connect the trails along Hines Drive to the Lower Rouge and downriver portions of the Rouge River Gateway Greenway. The Framework Plan identifies linkages between neighborhoods, communities, jobs, commercial areas, and destinations throughout the Rouge Valley.


Wayne County’s Hines Park Trail runs east-west and parallel to Hines Drive for 16 miles, and traverses through and along the east side of the City of Plymouth. The Framework Plan includes a number of recommendations and goals including widening the Hines Trail to 14-feet when possible and providing buffered

or protected bike lanes on Hines Drive. The Framework Plan also identifies a number of priority connections to/from the City of Plymouth including Plymouth Road/Main Street, and Ann Arbor Trail.

City of Plymouth Strategic Plan

The City Commission updated their Strategic Plan in the Spring of 2023. The Plan includes 4 goals and associated tasks to focus on in the coming year. The 4 goals include Sustainable Infrastructure, Staff Development/Training/Succession, Community Connectivity, and Attractive, Livable Community. A number of objectives and/or tasks within the Strategic Plan relate to parks and recreation including items such as:

- use of native and pollinator-friendly plants
- growing a mature tree canopy
- improve existing and pursue additional recreational and public green space opportunities for all ages
- determine direction for Recreation Master Plan 2024-2028
- review park sponsorship program
- identify green space for recreation department
- explore dog park
- citizen surveys for recreation and master plans
- provide for committee of the whole on recreation and planning master plans




Input

The City of Plymouth gathered input in a number of ways during the development of the Plan as is summarized on the following pages. Additional details are provided in the Appendix.

EPIC-MRA Phone Survey 2023

The City funded a telephone survey in September 2023 that focused on parks and recreation services as well as planning and development issues. Lansing-based EPIC-MRA was hired to develop and conduct the survey of 264 adult respondents living in the City. Some of the results are highlighted here (as noted in the EPIC-MRA summary document):

- The most visited recreational facilities by phone survey respondents visited are Kellogg Park, Hines Park, and Neighborhood Parks.
- It was nearly unanimous that telephone survey respondents believe that recreational activities, special events, and parks enhance home values and provide an economic benefit to the community.
- Nearly 8 in 10 respondents (79%) were in favor of the city purchasing activity space to replace green space lost due to the needs of the school district.
- 65% of respondents were 'aware' of Tonquish Creek Nature Area and 41% reported recent visitation.
- Just over 1/3 of respondents reported that they and/or another member of their household participates in an organized recreational activity.
- Regarding desired park amenities, an open ended question was asked with the top responses (besides undecided) being Playgrounds (14%), Walking Trails (9%), Dog Park (7%), and Soccer Fields (7%).



- In regard to bikes lanes, 46% responded they thought there were enough bike lanes and 47% think more bike racks are needed (particularly downtown and at Kellogg Park).
- The most preferred methods to receive information are via email, direct mail, and the city website

Online Questionnaire 2023

During the development of the Plan, and just after the phone survey was conducted, the City posted a questionnaire to their website as an informal opportunity for people to provide written input for consideration. The availability of the questionnaire was published via social media and was email blasted. The questionnaire was available from September 18 - September 27, 2023 and 371 responses were collected with approximately 80% being City residents and 16% residing in Plymouth Township. A few highlights are listed below with the full results in the Appendix.

- The most visited recreational facilities by respondents were Kellogg Park, City Neighborhood Parks, and Hines Park.
- 63.6% believe that Recreational Activities, Special Events and Provides provide *a lot of economic benefit* to the Plymouth Community.
- 79.5% of online respondents believe that maintained parks and green spaces *enhance the property values of homes by a lot*.
- 38.3% are very aware of Tonquish Creek Park and Nature Area while 18.1% are not aware of it all.
- 62.5% are in favor of the purchase of vacant land by the City at a future date in order to create new parks and restore recreational programming.
- The most preferred methods to receive information are via email, city website, and Facebook.
- In regard to bike lanes, 41% think there are enough bike lanes and 56.6% think there are enough bike racks.

City Commission Meeting Discussions


The 5 Year Plan and elements of the Plan were discussed at several Commission meetings (which are broadcast and open to the public) in August, September, and October 2023. This included review and discussion of priority capital improvements for parks at the August Commission Meeting. The draft plan was reviewed at the October 2023 City Commission meeting for further discussion prior to release and posting for broader public comment.

Public Hearing

A public hearing was held on November 20, 2023 in front of the City Commission in order to gather final comments on the draft Plan. A brief overview presentation was given prior to public comments and Commission discussion. _____ members of the public commented at the City Public Hearing.

<insert summary of comments>

The agenda and meeting minutes are included in the Appendix.



ACTION PLAN

The Action Plan outlines the direction that the City would like to pursue over the next five years to maintain and improve parks and recreation opportunities within the community. The findings and results summarized in the Basis for Action section of this Plan were utilized to develop the goals, objectives and capital improvement priorities detailed on the following pages.

The Plan is intended to serve as a guide and decision-making document for future recreation facilities and programs. The Action Plan outlines the improvements the City would like to focus on during the life of the Plan. The Plan is not intended to solve all of the issues, concerns and desires related to parks and recreation, rather to identify and document them so they can be addressed and focused on in the upcoming months and years.

Current funding and staffing levels at the City and are not sufficient for all of the ideas and desires documented in this Action Plan to be implemented – rather, this plan documents opportunities, desires and priorities to consider moving forward.

Goals and Objectives

As has been done in past City Parks and Recreation Master Plans, goals and objectives were developed to assist in providing direction to staff as well as the City Commission. The goals and objectives are intended to be as significant as the capital improvement priorities and serve to provide further guidance and direction to the City over the next five years. It is envisioned that this Action Plan will be reviewed on a regular basis and be utilized as a tool for decision making.

The following goals and objectives were developed by reviewing language from previous plans, brainstorming with City staff and leadership, as well as input from the telephone survey and online questionnaire. They are listed in no particular order of importance or priority.

City of Plymouth

PARKS + RECREATION GOALS

2024-2028



Connectivity + Accessibility

Strive to ensure connectivity and accessibility for all ages and abilities via improved pedestrian and bicyclist safety and mobility.



Natural Resources

Preserve and protect the natural resources and environmentally sensitive lands within the City while maintaining appropriate public use, access, and enjoyment.



Programs

Offer high-quality, diverse, accessible, and affordable parks and recreation programs.



Facilities

Where appropriate and possible, seek opportunities to improve and expand existing and potential future parks and recreation facilities.



Operations, Maintenance + Funding

Strive to ensure effective and efficient operation and maintenance of public parks and facilities and seek alternative funding sources and partnerships to assist in implementation.



Partnerships

When possible, coordinate with other recreation providers and entities in order to provide residents with diverse program and facility opportunities that are cost effective and efficient.



Connectivity + Accessibility

Strive to ensure connectivity and accessibility for all ages and abilities via improved pedestrian and bicyclist safety and mobility.

Objectives



Work to develop a **Community Connectivity (Nonmotorized) Plan** focused on opportunities to improve pedestrian and cyclist safety and mobility. Prioritize connectivity between the Township and City, downtown, Hines Park, 275 Bike Path, parks, and schools. Consider locations for sidewalks, trails, bike lanes, safe crossings, awareness and education.



Continue to focus on improving **barrier free and universal accessibility** at all City facilities and parks including access to picnic tables, grills, paths, playing fields, parking areas, restrooms, play equipment, etc.



Natural Resources

Preserve and protect the natural resources and environmentally sensitive lands within the City while maintaining appropriate public use, access, and enjoyment.

Objectives



When implementing improvements within Lion's Park and/or Tonquish Creek Park, do so in conjunction with the recommendations of the Rouge River Middle One Subwatershed Management Plan.



Strive to protect and restore water quality, stream channels and riparian corridors in public parks by implementing erosion control measures, and soft shoreline stabilization techniques



Utilize environmentally-friendly design and construction standards, including Low Impact Development (LID) techniques and stormwater best management practices when making improvements to City parks and facilities.



Promote the addition/creation of pollinator gardens on park properties where possible.



Programs

Offer high-quality, diverse, accessible, and affordable parks and recreation programs.

Objectives



When offering programs and/or expanding programs, seek a **diversity of options that are inclusive of all ages and abilities.**



Discuss ideas and methods for developing a **shared, online community resource.** The resource would serve as a central location and calendar for all recreational opportunities in Plymouth – including public, quasi-public and private program providers. This could involve stakeholders such as the Library, Schools, Township, City, YMCA, PCCA, PARC, etc. The goal of the community resource is to improve residents' ability to know what programs are offered and by whom.



Partnerships

When possible, coordinate with other recreation providers and entities in order to provide residents with diverse program and facility opportunities that are cost effective and efficient.

Objectives



The City should leave open all options to pursue opportunities to **develop partnerships** (public-public or public-private) that would benefit the greater good of the community.



Cooperate and collaborate with the Township, Schools, Wayne County and nearby communities to avoid duplication and reduce redundancy.



Consider **formal partnerships** to invest in green space improvements and/or maintenance in exchange for reduced rate/free use of property by City programs.



Maintain **high levels of communication and cooperation** with the various service clubs, associations and athletic organizations.



Facilities

Where appropriate and possible, seek opportunities to improve and expand existing and potential future parks and recreation facilities.

Objectives



Be aware of **real estate, and underused public and private properties** that may become available for use and/or expansion of public recreation areas, particularly in those areas of the community that are currently underserved, as well as properties no longer utilized by the school district, or other agencies within or adjacent to the City. Evaluate for use as recreation facility and/or park.



Prioritize **acquisition and development of property** for elements such as athletic fields, pickleball courts, dog park, play structures, synthetic turf surface, etc.



Continue to seek opportunities and partnerships with public and private land owners for the development of **additional turf/field sport facilities**.



Continue to make improvements at the **Cultural Center** in order to remain as one of the premier ice facilities in the area. Potential improvements include LED lighting upgrades, energy efficient windows, new insulated roof, as well as solar power to offset electrical use at the building.



A number of the play structures in City of Plymouth parks are aging. Plan for **replacement of play structures** at a number of City Parks as proposed in the Capital Improvement Priorities table. Consider making a variety of unique destinations with modern and challenging equipment.



Continue to work to improve the **ADA accessibility** at all parks by providing elements such as barrier free play equipment, pathways to and from facilities, bleachers, playground surfacing, etc. All new additions to parks and facilities should be designed to be universally accessible to ensure access and use by people of all abilities.



Maintain **Kellogg Park** as a focal point in downtown Plymouth and a gathering space for the community. Consider a turf management program due to the heavy use of the park.



Pursue options and determine feasibility for a **Dog Park**.



Operations, Maintenance + Funding

Strive to ensure effective and efficient operation and maintenance of public parks and facilities and seek alternative funding sources and partnerships to assist in implementation.

Objectives



Ensure investment into **high quality maintenance and upkeep** of public parks, particularly those that are heavily used such as Kellogg Park, Cultural Center and neighborhood parks.



Continue the commitment to **fiscal responsibility** by exploring and seeking avenues to generate alternative revenue sources through donations, fees, foundations, grants, sponsorships and partnerships.



All improvements and additions to parks should be done so with **long-term maintenance** in mind including materials and placement. Review proposed improvements with maintenance staff for input.



Current funding and staffing levels are not sufficient for all of the desired improvements and programs to be implemented. Seek voter input on **possible millage for parks and recreation**. In addition, consider and plan for staffing needs if funding levels increase and/or if significant programming or facility expansions come to fruition.



Review Master Plan on an annual basis (a few months prior to annual Commission budget meetings may be ideal) to ensure continued progress and focus.

Capital Improvement Priorities

The capital improvement priorities for this Parks and Recreation Plan have been established for two primary reasons:

- to function as a planning framework and guide for the City Commission and municipal staff; and,
- to enable the City to apply for grant funding for proposed projects.

The capital improvement priorities table is not a fixed element and is neither all inclusive or exclusive. The table reflects the results of brainstorming, data gathering, analysis and input from a variety of sources during the planning process. It is likely that the opportunities and plan may change at some point during the next five years due to unanticipated circumstances such as private donations, changing recreation trends, funding alternatives, community opinion and/or available grants. Funding availability is a key factor in the City's ability to implement the capital improvement priorities.

The following capital improvement priorities table details the desired improvements for the years 2024-2028. The opportunities are listed by short-term (1-2 yrs), mid-term (3-5 yrs), long-term (greater than 5 yrs), as well as 'To Be Determined/On-going' for those items that the Commission has not yet determined order of priority and/or items that may be revisited/evaluated each year. It is difficult to predict desires, funding availability, etc., in the years to come. However, it is important to note that parks and recreation capital projects undertaken by the City should address the goals set forth in this Plan.

Abbreviations for potential funding sources are provided in the table and listed below.

TBD = To Be Determined

MNRTF = Michigan Natural Resources Trust Fund

LWCF = Land and Water Conservation Fund

RPGP = Recreation Passport Grant Program

PPPE = Parks & Public Property Expenditures

ROF = Recreation Operating Fund

WCPM = Wayne County Parks Mileage

GF = General Fund


City of Plymouth
Capital + Large-Scale Operational Priorities
 2024-2028

CITY OF PLYMOUTH GENERAL ITEMS	Magnitude of Cost	Term			Possible Funding Sources
		Short-Term (1-2 yrs)	Mid-Term (3-5 yrs)	Long-Term (5+yrs)	
New Park Acquisition/Development (pavilions, pickleball, play structures, parking)	\$5.6M			X	Potential Millage, MNRTF Grant
Synthetic Athletic Field (Location TBD)	\$2.95M			X	Potential Millage
Operate Irrigation system at heavy use parks	\$50,000/yr			X	Potential Millage
Increase Outdoor Maintenance Staffing	\$90,000/yr			X	Potential Millage
Increase Recreation/Programming Staffing	\$90,000/yr			X	Potential Millage
Programming Fee Offset - Youth Sports	\$40,000/yr			X	Potential Millage
Cultural Center & Ice Arena					
LED Lighting Upgrade	\$40,000		X		Wayne Co Parks Millage
Replace roof - insulate for energy efficiency	\$1.2M		X		State of Michigan Grant (Community Centers), Potential Millage
Replace windows - energy efficient	\$300,000		X		State of Michigan Grant (Community Centers), Potential Millage
Solar installation	\$600,000			X	TBD
Outdoor Pickleball Court (1 - replace shuffleboard)	\$75,000	X			General Fund
Parking Lot Renovations	\$500,000			X	TBD
Expanded Office Space	\$750,000			X	TBD
Don Massey Field					
Top Dressing Infield	\$5,000		X		Recreation Operating Fund, WC Parks Millage
Removal or Replacement of Lighting	\$80,000		X		Wayne County Parks Millage
Parking Lot Renovations	\$300,000			X	TBD
New Fencing	\$150,000			X	TBD
Bleachers/Sunshade	\$150,000			X	TBD
ADA Bathrooms	\$180,000			X	TBD
Knights of Columbus Park					
Refurbish/Upgrade Play Structure	\$200,000			X	Potential Millage
Safety Surfacing Under Play Structure	\$30,000	X			Potential Millage, PPPE
Pavilion Replacement	\$50,000			X	Potential Millage
Fairground Park					
Refurbish/Upgrade Play Structure	\$250,000			X	Potential Millage
Safety Surfacing Under Play Structure	\$50,000		X		Potential Millage, PPPE
Turf Replacement + Irrigation	\$40,000			X	Potential Millage
Pavilion with ADA Walkways	\$160,000			X	Potential Millage
Garden Club Park					
Refurbish/Upgrade Play Structure	\$200,000			X	Potential Millage
Safety Surfacing Under Play Structure	\$50,000	X			Potential Millage, PPPE
Turf Replacement + Irrigation	\$20,000			X	Potential Millage
Pavilion Maintenance/Replacement	\$60,000			X	Potential Millage
Hough Park					
On-going General Maintenance	\$10,000			X	GF, PPPE
Markham Park					
On-going General Maintenance	\$5,000			X	GF, PPPE

To Be Determined / On-Going

City of Plymouth
Capital + Large-Scale Operational Priorities
 2024-2028

Project Description	Magnitude of Cost			Possible Funding Sources		
	Short-Term (1-2 yrs)	Mid-Term (3-5 yrs)	Long-Term (5+yrs)	Short-Term (1-2 yrs)	Mid-Term (3-5 yrs)	Long-Term (5+yrs)
Kiwamis Club Park						
Safety Surfacing Under Play Structure						Potential Millage, PPPE
Turf Replacement + Irrigation				X		Potential Millage
Smith Park						
Replace Play Structures						Potential Millage
Safety Surfacing Under Play Structure				X		Potential Millage, PPPE
Irrigation Repair						Potential Millage
Replace Pavilion						Potential Millage
Rotary Club Park						
Refurbish/Upgrade Play Structure						Potential Millage
Add Irrigation						Potential Millage
Jack Wilcox Park						
Replace Play Structures						Potential Millage
Safety Surfacing Under Play Structure				X		Potential Millage, PPPE
Kellogg Park						
Upgrade Benches						Potential Millage
Bi-Annual Turf Replacement						Potential Millage
Lion's Club Park						
Grade west end for play area (5v5 practice area)						Potential Millage
Safety Surfacing Under Play Structure				X		Potential Millage, PPPE
Starkweather Park						
Gazebo Replacement						Potential Millage
Add Irrigation						Potential Millage
Tonquish Creek Neighborhood Park						
Phase I Improvements: Boardwalk, Bridge, Trail, Entries, Lights, Etc.						MNRTF, LWCF, Potential Millage



APPENDIX

Public Survey Results

Public Hearing Meeting Minutes

Resolution of Adoption

City of Plymouth Citizen Survey September 2023

Presented by:

EPIC ■ MRA

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY and DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS



Table of Contents

METHODOLOGY	1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
-- PARKS AND RECREATIONAL ACTIVITY OPPORTUNITIES	3
-- BICYCLES	4
-- HOUSING	4
-- TREES AND LANDSCAPING.....	5
-- UPSHOT OF THE FINDINGS	6
QUESTION-BY-QUESTION RESULTS.....	8
-- VALUE OF RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES AND GREEN SPACE – Q’s. 2 & 3	8
-- AWARENESS OF TONQUISH CREEK PARK AND NATURE AREA – Q. 4	8
-- FUTURE POSSIBLE PURCHASE OF LAND FOR PARKS – Q. 5	10
-- PREFERRED PARK AMENITIES – Q. 6	10
-- PARTICIPATION IN ORGANIZED RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES – Q. 7	11
-- TYPES OF ORGANIZED RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES – Q. 8	13
-- WHAT NEW RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES TO ADD? – Q. 9	13
-- ADEQUACY OF BICYCLE LANES – Q. 10	14
-- WHERE TO CREATE MORE BICYCLE LANES? – Q. 11	15
-- SUFFICIENT NUMBER OF BIKE RACKS – Q. 12	16
-- WHERE TO LOCATE MORE BIKE RACKS? – Q. 13	17
-- MEASUREMENT OF PARK AND RECREATION FACILITY ATTENDANCE – Qs. 14-24	18
-- PREFERRED MODE OF LEARNING ABOUT ACTIVITIES/EVENTS – Q. 25	19
-- OPINION ABOUT MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING – Q. 26.....	20
-- FAVOR/OPPOSE DUPLEXES IN SINGLE-FAMILY NEIGHBORHOODS – Q. 28	21
-- FAVOR/OPPOSE 2 ND LEVEL GARAGE ADU – Q. 28.....	22
-- SIZE AND MASS OF SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES SINCE COVID – Q. 29	23
-- CITIZEN OPINION ABOUT HOME MASS & SIZE ORDINANCE – Q. 30	24
-- HEIGHT OF SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES SINCE COVID – Q. 31	26
-- CITIZEN OPINION ABOUT HOME HEIGHT ORDINANCE – Q. 32	27
-- HEIGHT OF DETACHED GARAGES SINCE COVID – Q. 33	28
-- CITIZEN OPINION ABOUT GARAGE HEIGHT ORDINANCE – Q. 34	29
-- PERCEPTION OF EFFECT OF PLYMOUTH’S TREE ORDINANCE – Q. 35.....	31
-- PERCEPTION OF EFFECT OF PLYMOUTH’S LANDSCAPE ORDINANCE – Q. 35.....	32
RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHICS.....	34

METHODOLOGY

EPIC ▪ MRA administered interviews with 264 adult residents residing within the City of Plymouth, Michigan from September 11th through September 15th, 2023. Respondents were selected utilizing an interval method of randomly selecting records of published residential telephone numbers. In addition, a commercially available list of cell phones - designated as being in the possession of city residents - was obtained. Eighty percent of the sample, or 214 interviews, were completed via cell phone contact. Interviews were terminated if, in response to the initial question of the interview, the respondent reported living somewhere other than in the City of Plymouth.


In interpreting survey results, all surveys are subject to error; that is, the results of the survey may differ from those that would have been obtained if the entire populations were interviewed. This “margin of error” quantifies the degree to which random sampling will differ from a survey of the entire population, taking into account, among other things, the disposition of individuals who do not complete the interview. Put another way, the opinions of those who are not randomly selected or who decline to be interviewed, are no more or less likely to be different – within the margin of error – than the opinions of those who complete an interview and are included in the sample. The size of sampling error depends on the total number of respondents to the particular question.

For example, a “Total” Oppose of 52 percent was recorded in response to the hypothetical proposition of, *“Would you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose, or strongly oppose the City of Plymouth allowing duplexes to be built in single-family residential neighborhoods”* (Q. 27). As indicated in the chart that follows, this percentage would have a sampling error of plus or minus 6.0 points. This means that with repeated sampling, it is very likely (95 times out of every 100), the percentage for the entire population would fall between 58 percent and 46 percent, hence 52 percent \pm 6.0 points.

EPIC • MRA SAMPLING ERROR BY PERCENTAGE (AT 95 IN 100 CONFIDENCE LEVEL)

Percentage of sample giving specific response

SAMPLE SIZE:	<u>10</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>90</u>
	% margin of error ±								
650	2.3	3.1	3.5	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.1	2.3
600	2.4	3.2	3.7	3.9	4.0	3.9	3.7	3.2	2.4
550	2.5	3.3	3.8	4.1	4.2	4.1	3.8	3.3	2.5
500	2.6	3.5	4.0	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.0	3.5	2.6
450	2.8	3.7	4.2	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.2	3.7	2.8
400	2.9	3.9	4.5	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.5	3.9	2.9
350	3.1	4.2	4.8	5.1	5.2	5.1	4.8	4.2	3.1
300	3.4	4.5	5.2	5.5	5.7	5.5	5.2	4.5	3.4
250	3.7	5.0	5.7	6.1	6.2	6.1	5.7	5.0	3.7
200	4.2	5.5	6.4	6.8	6.9	6.8	6.4	5.5	4.2
150	4.8	6.4	7.3	7.8	8.0	7.8	7.3	6.4	4.8
100	5.9	7.8	9.0	9.6	9.8	9.6	9.0	7.8	5.9
50	8.3	11.1	12.7	13.6	13.9	13.6	12.7	11.1	8.3



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

EPIC ▪ MRA was commissioned in September 2023 by the City of Plymouth to measure public opinion about a variety of city-specific features and policies, focusing attention on parks, recreation opportunities, housing, and issues related to them. Questions going to bicycle accommodations, and the effectiveness of ordinances concerning the tree canopy and residential lot landscaping were also tested.

-- Parks and Recreational Activity Opportunities

There was near unanimity among respondents that recreational activities, special events, and parks enhance home values and provide an economic benefit to the community as a whole; a sentiment quite strongly held. This observation is substantiated by the nearly eight-in-ten respondents who reported being in favor of the city purchasing activity space to replace the space lost to the school district's needs. The value of parks to respondents can also be found in the responses given to which recreational facilities they or a member of their household has . . . *visited within the past year.*

When presented with a list of eleven separate public and/or privately maintained facilities, four of them were City of Plymouth sites – Kellogg, Hines, City neighborhood parks, and Plymouth Cultural Center – which found from 95 percent to 65 percent of respondents reporting affirmatively that a household member had recently visited it. Two private concerns – P.A.R.C. (64%) and private fitness center (58%) – were the only two other venues receiving a majority of respondents reporting visitation. While 65 percent of respondents indicated an “Awareness” of Tonquish Creek Park and Nature Area in an earlier question, just 41 percent reported recent visitation. The Don Massey Baseball/Softball Field received the lowest proportion among city-owned facilities at 22 percent, private dance and art studios received fewer than one-in-five respondents answering in the affirmative about visitation.

Consistent with the number of respondents reporting school-age children in their household (33%), just over one-third of respondents reported that either they and/or another member of their household participates in an organized recreational activity. When asked what park amenities might be preferred in any new space acquired, *Playgrounds* garnered the most responses (14%), but there were more than two dozen other specific responses to this open-ended question. Substantiating this correlation are the results of an open-ended question asking what type of activities these respondents engaged in, where Soccer (21%) and other youth team sports

captured the lion's share of the up-to-four responses solicited. Moreover, an immediately following open-ended question asked respondents to identify any other not-currently-offered activity or league the city might sponsor. In response, half of respondents were unable to offer a specific response, and to the extent any were offered, *Pickleball* was the only item breaking double digits.

Up to three responses were recorded for an open-ended question asking respondents for their preferred method of receiving information about recreational or special events in the city. In all, over a dozen different categories were mentioned, with *Email* (44%) and *Direct mail* (20%) being the two most mentioned modes of communication for this purpose. Other frequently mentioned means were, *City website* (10%), *Facebook* (8%), and *Text Message* (6%).

-- Bicycles

Again, one-third shows up as the proportion of respondents who were of the opinion that *More* bicycle lanes are needed in the city. Only 15 percent reported their belief that there are *Too Many*, with the balance expressing the opinion that there were *Enough* (21%) or were undecided (6%) on the question. These proportions shifted, however, when it came to opinions about the number of bicycle racks needed. For bike racks, nearly half of respondents (47%) reported *More* were needed, compared to the one-third who believed there are already *Enough*.

For those who expressed that *More* lanes or racks were needed for bicycles, a follow-up open-ended question accepted up-to-two responses as to where the respondent would like to see them located. In the case of bike lanes, Ann Arbor Trail, Main, Penniman, and Harvey together received over half of all of the over fourteen specific responses. As for more bike rack locations, *Downtown* captured nearly one-in-four responses and together with *Kellogg Park* (20%) and *Near Parks* (12%), the three locations account for more than half of thirteen site-specific responses.

-- Housing

The topic of housing was introduced with a question asking respondents to express whether they believed the City of Plymouth has *Too Many*, *Too Few*, or *About the Right Amount* of multi-family housing units, described as including duplexes, apartments, and townhomes. Opinion was split at 17 percent apiece between "too many" and "too few", with a strong majority of 58 percent reporting "enough". In a follow-up question asking if the city should allow more duplexes in residential areas, however, a slim 52 percent majority reported being *Oppose[d]* to the notion, with 37 percent saying they favored the proposition. Importantly, the intensity of

sentiment among opponents of more duplexes – as expressed by the modifier *Strongly* – was nearly two-and-half times that of those expressing support.

Respondents were next given a description of accessory dwelling units (ADUs), which referred to them as separate same-lot detached housing units that may or may not be used for short or long-term rental. The question went on to ask if the respondent would Favor or Oppose allowing ADUs on the second level of detached garages. A strong 59 percent majority were in “favor” of such a proposal compared to the 37 percent expressing opposition, with the intensity of those favoring being slightly higher than intensity of opposition.

The size and height of single-family homes and the height of garages were the next focus of the interview, with each of these three inquiries being a measurement of opinion of about whether the size and height regulations in city ordinance has been observed post-COVID – that is, since March of 2020. As for the size and height of post-COVID construction of single-family homes, respondents were in a statistical tie (46% “yes” – 48% “no”) regarding the appropriateness (not necessarily compliance with city ordinance) of their size, but were more certain about the new construction height, with two-thirds reporting it has been appropriate.

Consistent with their perceptions of the appropriateness of single-family new construction size and height, considerably fewer respondents expressed a belief that the city ordinance specifications governing the height of homes should be *Decreased* (23%), than those reporting a preference for a decrease in size specifications (37%).

When the same pairing of questions was presented regarding the height of detached garages, the results were decidedly more lopsided than with single-family homes. Perhaps reflecting the receptivity to ADUs discussed above, over three-quarters of respondents perceived the height of post-COVID detached garages as being appropriate and only 10 percent expressed a preference for the city to decrease the height specifications for these structures.

-- Trees and Landscaping

Respondents were informed that a 2017 city ordinance aimed to increase the number of trees in the city and were then asked if they believed if *Enough*, *Too Much*, or *Too Little* was done in this regard. The next question posed the same inquiry regarding a 2023 ordinance setting the minimum square footage of landscaped area on all residential property. As can be seen in the comparison of results chart below, the greatest area of disparity between the results lies in the volunteered response of *Unaware* of the ordinance, which is over three times higher in the case of the landscaping ordinance than the ordinance concerning trees.

2017 Tree Ordinance		2023 Landscaping Ordinance
48%	Done Enough	42%
29%	Done Too Little	21%
10%	Done Too Much	7%
5%	Unaware (volunteered)	18%
8%	Undecided	12%

-- Upshot of the Findings

The residents of the City of Plymouth value their parks and the recreational opportunities available to them. So much so, most report at least one household member having visited a park within the last year. Moreover, they overwhelmingly say “yes” in response to a question generally asking if the city should expend funds to replace green space (and its attendant youth sports programming) lost to the school district. It is cautioned, however, that this question did not apprise respondents of many important particulars of such a purchase (i.e., cost, location, etc.), so any official decisions in this regard should not place too much reliance on this single result to a very generalized proposition.

One-third of respondents expressed a preference for more bicycle lanes to be established, with four major thoroughfares dominating the specific locales named as where they should be located. Unlike with bike lanes, a strong plurality of respondents reported a preference for the city to provide more bicycle racks. Kellogg Park and Downtown were overwhelmingly named as the preferred places for the location of more bike racks.

As for local availability of multi-family housing, a strong majority of residents express the belief that there is the right amount of these types of dwellings, and they are opposed to allowing duplexes in neighborhoods otherwise filled with single-family homes. These findings notwithstanding, there is great receptivity to the city allowing ADUs to be established on the second level of detached garages; a finding consistent with the three-quarters of respondents’ perceptions’ that the height of post-COVID construction of garages has been “appropriate”, and the only one-in-ten expressing a desire to see this garage height specification “decreased”.

Unlike the questions regarding garage heights, there is greater difference of opinion when it comes to the size of single-family homes. There is a virtual tie in perception concerning the “appropriateness” of post-COVID construction home size and nearly two-of-five respondents

express a preference for the ordinance regulating home size decrease the allowed mass of new homes. As for the height of homes, respondent sentiment is not nearly as acute as it is regarding home size and indeed, is closer to the proportions expressed about garage heights.

QUESTION-BY-QUESTION RESULTS

-- Value of Recreation Opportunities and Green Space – Q’s. 2 & 3

Two initial survey questions – the presentation of which was rotated – went to respondents’ perceptions of the economic benefit of maintained parks and availability of recreation activities have for the community as a whole and residents’ home values, particularly. The available response options were, *A lot, Some, Only a little, and No benefit at all.*


The questions read:

How much of an economic benefit do you believe that Recreational Activities, Special Events and Park provide to the Plymouth Community?

and,

How much do you believe that maintained parks and green spaces enhance the property values of homes in the Plymouth Community?


The chart below illustrates the results for these two questions:



With such overwhelming results, subgroup breakouts are not instructive.

-- Awareness of Tonquish Creek Park and Nature Area – Q. 4

Respondents were next asked to assess their level of awareness of the Tonquish Creek Park and Nature area. The available responses for awareness levels were : *Very, Somewhat, Only a little, and Not aware at all.* The graph that follows illustrates that just under two-out-of-three respondents reported at least “somewhat” aware of the existence of Tonquish.



Subgroups reporting "Little/Not at all" in proportions greater than the norm of the combined 34% included:


- 53% Visited Tonquish – No
- 52% Residency – 1-5 Years
- 50% Visited Any Park – No
- 48% Age 18-34
- 42% Bike Lanes – Need more
- 45% Visited PARC – No
- 44% Home Sizes Right after COVID? – Yes
- 44% Parks Enhance Home Values – Little/Not at all
- 42% Home Size Ordinance – Don't change
- 40% Visited Don Massey – No
- Garage Height Ordinance – Increase
- Tree Ordinance – Done Enough

Subgroups reporting "Very/Somewhat" in proportions greater than the norm of the combined 65% included:

- 91% Visited Tonquish – Yes
- 85% Visited Private Dance – Yes
- 82% Visited Don Massey – Yes
- 80% Landscape Ordinance – Too Little
- 78% Garage Height Ordinance – Decrease
- 77% Recreation Participation – HH member
- 76% Home Sizes Right after COVID? – No
- Home Size Ordinance – Decrease
- Home Height Ordinance – Decrease
- Residency – 16+ Years
- 75% Home Height Right after COVID? – No
- 71% Visited PARC – Yes
- 72% Number of Multi-Family – Too Few
- Garage Height Right after COVID – No
- Tree Ordinance – Too Little
- Children at Home? – Yes
- 70% Bike Racks – Enough
- Visited Private Gym – Yes
- Age 50-64
- Age 65+

-- Future Possible Purchase of Land for Parks – Q. 5

Respondents were told the city had lost activity space due to the needs of the school district. They were then asked if they would be in favor of the city’s future purchase of vacant land to replace the green space lost to the school district and reestablish recreational programs eliminated due to that loss. As can be seen in the graph below, nearly eight-in-ten respondents reported *Yes* in response to this framing of the question.




Subgroups reporting “No” in proportions greater than the norm of 12% included:

- 26% *Parks' Economic Benefit to Community – Little/None*
- 23% *Bike Lanes – Too Many*
- 21% *Parks' Benefit to Home Values – Little/None*
- 19% *Age 65+*
- 18% *Allow ADU's – Oppose*
- Landscape Ordinance – Too Little*
- 17% *Recreation Participation – HH member*
- Bike Racks – Enough*

-- Preferred Park Amenities – Q. 6

Respondents were next presented with an opportunity to express their preference for which park amenities should be included if additional funding for park development became available to the city. In response to this open-ended question, 29 separate categories of park amenities were reported, including two percent responding, *None/nothing*. The only specifically mentioned item reaching double digits – at 14 percent – was *Playgrounds/Playscapes*. Several of the other specifically mentioned categories could arguably be grouped together to reach double digits (e.g., *tennis courts, pickleball courts, basketball courts, baseball fields, soccer fields, and athletic fields generally*), but the unique requirements of each of these courts and

fields argued for separate categorization. The chart below illustrates the distribution of responses for the eight specific responses garnering four percent or more mentions, along with those 10 percent who were *undecided*.



Subgroups reporting "Playgrounds" in proportions greater than the norm of 14% included:

- 26% Visited Don Massey – Yes
- 23% Bike Lanes – Too Many
- 20% Bike Racks – Enough
- 19% Bike Lanes – Enough
- Allow ADUs – Oppose

Subgroups reporting "Dog Park" in proportions greater than the norm of 7% included:


- 15% Residency – 1-5 Years
- 11% Visited PARC – Yes
- Home Heights Right after COVID? – No

Subgroups reporting "Open Space" in proportions greater than the norm of 6% included:

- 12% Tree Ordinance – Too Little
- Age 18-34

-- Participation in Organized Recreational Activities – Q. 7

An even two-thirds of respondents reported that neither they nor any other member of their household *participate[s] in a recreational or athletic program organized by a league or association*.



Subgroups reporting "Yes" in proportions greater than the norm of the combined 34% included:


- 71% Age 35-49
- 65% Children at Home? – Yes
- 53% Visited School Playground – Yes
- 49% Visited Private Dance – Yes
- 49% Visited Private Art – Yes
- 49% Residency – 6-15 Years
- 48% Info Source – Text Message
- 44% Visited PARC – Yes
- 44% Visited Don Massey – Yes
- 43% Visited Cultural Center – Yes
- 41% Visited Tonquish – Yes
- 39% Visted Private Gym – Yes
- 39% Info Source – Facebook

Subgroups reporting "No" in proportions greater than the norm of 66% included:

- 85% School Playground – Haven't Visited
- 85% Age 65+
- 83% Cultural Center – Haven't Visited
- 83% PARC -- Haven't Visited
- 81% Children at Home? – No
- 76% Parks' Economic Benefit to Community – Little/None
- 76% Age 18-34
- 75% Parks Enhance Home Values – Little/Not at all
- 74% Residency – 1-5 Years
- 73% Private Gym – Haven't Visited
- 73% Age 50-64
- 73% Residency 16+ Years
- 71% Tonquish – Unaware
- 71% Info Source – Direct Mail
- 71% Garage Height Ordinance – Increase

-- Types of Organized Recreational Activities – Q. 8

Respondents reporting household participation in organized recreation activities in the previous question (n=90) were asked which types of activities the household members engaged in. Up to four responses were allowed in this open-ended question. This resulted in over 26 separate categories of activities being recorded, with over 16 of them being mentioned by three percent or fewer of the respondents. The following chart illustrates the distribution of the predominant responses:



Subgroups reporting "Soccer" in proportions greater than the norm of 21% included:

- 28% Home Size Ordinance – Decrease
- 27% Home Sizes Right after COVID? – No
- Garage Height Right after COVID – Yes
- Children at Home – Yes
- Residency 6-15 Years
- 26% Recreation Participation – HH member

With a total n-size of 90 for this question, further subset analysis would not be instructive.

-- What New Recreational Activities to Add? – Q. 9

All respondents were asked to identify any new *activities, recreational or athletic programs, or leagues*, the City of Plymouth should offer that are not currently offered. Unlike

the results of Question 6, which asked what types of facilities respondents would like to see more of should the city find funding for it, this “new activities” question produced 50 percent of the sample to report either *Nothing/None* (14%) or *Undecided* (36%), compared to the combined 12 percent not offering a specific response in the previous question.


As with the prior question, however, the responses covered a wide range of activities covering over 19 separate categories. The highest proportions of specific activity responses were: *Pickleball* (12%), *Tennis* (5%), with *Soccer* and *Swimming* at four percent each. The remaining cited activities garnered three percent or less of the responses from the 132 respondents naming a specific activity in answer to this question.

Subgroups reporting “Pickleball” in proportions greater than the norm of 12% included:

- 19% Age 50-64
- Residency 1-5 Years
- 17% Age 35-49

-- Adequacy of Bicycle Lanes – Q. 10

The interview moved next to a series of questions involving the city’s attention to bike traffic. In the first of this series, all respondents were asked to report their perception of the adequacy of the number of bicycle lanes throughout the city. The response options for this inquiry were: *Enough*, *Too many*, and *Too few*. If a respondent reported their belief that there were too few lanes, they were asked to offer a gradation of *Many* or *Some*, to describe how many more lanes are needed. The graph below illustrates the distribution of responses:



Subgroups reporting "More" in proportions greater than the norm of the combined 33% included:


- 51% Garage Height Ordinance – Increase
- 49% Bike Lanes – More
- Info Source – Direct Mail
- 45% Landscape Ordinance – Too Little
- 43% Allow More Duplexes – Favor
- 41% Home Height Ordinance – Decrease
- 40% Tonquish – Not Aware
- Age 18-34
- 38% Tree Ordinance – Too Little

Subgroups reporting "Too many" in proportions greater than the norm of 15% included:

- 29% Parks' Economic Benefit to Community – Little/None
- 20% Multi-Family Housing – More
- Home Sizes Right after COVID? – No
- Garage Height Ordinance – Increase
- 19% Age 65+

-- Where to Create More Bicycle Lanes? – Q. 11

For the eighty-seven respondents reporting an opinion that "More" bike lanes were needed, a follow-up question asked them to identify where in the city they would like to see them located. Over 14 separate locations were named in response to this question, which allowed up to two responses to be recorded. The top cited locations are illustrated in the chart below:




Subgroups reporting "Ann Arbor Trail" in proportions greater than the norm of 20% included:

- 26% Tonquish – Aware
- Visited School Playground – Yes

With a total n-size of 87 for this question, further subset analysis would not be instructive.

-- Sufficient Number of Bike Racks – Q. 12

In a question framed like the preceding question regarding bike lanes, respondents were asked to report if they believed there were *Enough*, *Too many*, or if *More* bike racks were needed in the city. Again, for those reporting “more”, a follow-up asked them to assess the degree to which they believed more were needed by selecting either *Many* or *Some* as a gradation option. As the graph below illustrates, a plurality of respondents expressed the opinion that “more” bike racks are needed throughout the city.



Subgroups reporting “More” in proportions greater than the norm of the combined 47% included:


- 70% Bike Lanes – More
- 64% Age 18-34
- 62% Residency – 1-5 Years
- 61% Visited Private Art Studio – Yes
- Landscape Ordinance – Too Little
- 57% Home Height Ordinance – Decrease
- Tree Ordinance – Too Little
- 55% Visited PARC – Yes
- 56% Home Size Ordinance – Decrease
- 54% Visited Private Gym – Yes
- 53% Info Source – Email
- Home Heights Right after COVID? – No
- 52% Parks’ Economic Benefit to Community – A Lot/Some
- Visited School Playground – Yes
- Home Sizes Right after COVID? – No

Subgroups reporting “Enough” in proportions greater than the norm of 33% included:

- 48% Recreation Participation – HH member
- 45% Bike Lanes – Enough
- 43% Parks' Economic Benefit to Community – Little/None
- 42% Children at Home? – Yes
- 41% Garage Height Ordinance – Increase
- 40% Visited Don Massey – Yes
- Home Sizes Right after COVID? – Yes
- Landscape Ordinance – Enough
- 38% Parks Enhance Home Values – Little/Not at all

-- Where to Locate More Bike Racks? – Q. 13

For those reporting an opinion that “More” bike racks were needed, a follow-up question asked them to identify where in the city they would like to see the racks located. Again, over 14 separate locations were named in response to this question, which allowed up to two responses to be recorded, with Downtown and Kellog Park capturing the lion’s share of responses. The top cited locations are illustrated in the chart below:



Subgroups reporting “Downtown” in proportions greater than the norm of 24% included:

- 39% Residency – 6-15 Years
- 37% Visited a Private Gym – No
- 30% Bike Lanes – Enough
- Multi-Family Housing – About Right
- Home Size Ordinance – Keep the Same
- 29% Info Source – Direct Mail

-- Measurement of Park and Recreation Facility Attendance – Qs. 14-24

The next section of the interview presented respondents with names or descriptions of eleven separate City-owned or commercial facilities and asked them to report if anyone in their household had visited the location in the past year. The individual names/descriptions were presented in a rotated fashion to avoid possible bias introduced by a static order of presentation.

As can be seen in the chart that follows, six of the eleven items presented garnered more than half of respondents answering in the affirmative, with three of them receiving a well-in-excess of 80 percent affirmative proportion. Commercially owned art and dance studios received an affirmative response from fewer than one-in-five respondents.

The following chart illustrates the responses to each of the eleven presented items, sorted in order of highest to lowest respondent household member visitation.

***INTRO TO Q.14:** Now I would like to read a list of recreational facilities to you. For each, please tell me if you or any other members of your household have visited that facility within the past year. The first one is...*

[READ AND ROTATED]	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>UND/ REF</u>
Kellogg Park	95%	5%	---
Hines Park	90%	10%	---
Any City Neighborhood Park	87%	13%	---
Plymouth Cultural Center	65%	34%	1%
P.A.R.C. (the privately owned, former Central Middle School)	64%	36%	0%
Any commercially owned fitness center or gym	58%	42%	---
Any school playground or gymnasium	49%	51%	0%
Tonquish Creek Park and Nature Area	41%	58%	1%
Don Massey Baseball / Softball Field	22%	78%	0%
Any commercially owned art studio	18%	82%	---
Any commercially owned dance studio	13%	86%	1%

Subgroups reporting "No" for the Plymouth Cultural Center in proportions greater than the norm of 34% included:


- 56% Visited PARC – No
Residency – 1-5 Years
- 48% Age 18-34
- 43% Recreation Participation – No HH members
- 40% Visited School Playground – No
Age 65+
- 41% Info Source – Direct Mail
- 39% Visited Private Gym – No
Children at Home? – No
- 38% Multi-Family Housing – More
Home Size Ordinance – Keep the Same
Tree Ordinance – Enough

Subgroups reporting "No" for the P.A..R.C. in proportions greater than the norm of 36% included:

- 59% Visited Cultural Center – No
- 50% Parks' Economic Benefit to Community – Little/None
Visited Tonquish – No
- 48% Visited School Playground – No
- 47% Tonquish – Unaware
Info Source – Direct Mail
Children at Home? – No
- 45% Parks Enhance Home Values – Little/Not at all
Recreation Participation – No HH members
Age 65+
Residency – 1-5 Years
- 42% Allow More Duplexes – Favor
- 41% Visited Private Dance – No
Multi-Family Housing – More
- 40% Bike Lanes – Too Many
Bike Racks – Enough
Visited Private Art Studio – No
Home Size Ordinance – Keep the Same
Age 50-64

-- Preferred Mode of Learning About Activities/Events – Q. 25

As a follow-up to the visitation measurement battery, respondents were asked their preferred method of receiving information about recreation and special events. Up to two responses were recorded, with the top method being *Email* (44%), followed by *Direct Mail* (20%), and the *City Website* (10%). The following chart illustrates the distribution of the major responses:



Subgroups reporting "Email" in proportions greater than the norm of 44% included:

- 54% Children at Home? – Yes
- 53% Visited Art Studio – Yes
- 52% Recreation Participation – HH members
- 51% Home Size Ordinance – Decrease
- Home Height Ordinance – Decrease
- 50% Home Sizes Right after COVID? – No
- 49% Visited PARC – Yes
- Visited School Playground – Yes


Subgroups reporting "Direct Mail" in proportions greater than the norm of 20% included:

- 27% Bike Lanes – More
- Visited PARC – No
- Age 65+
- 26% Parks' Economic Benefit to Community – Little/None
- 25% Parks Enhance Home Values – Little/Not at all
- Visited Cultural Center – No
- Visited School Playground – No
- Landscape Ordinance – Too Little
- Children at Home? – No

-- Opinion About Multi-Family Housing – Q. 26

The interview next turned to the topic of housing in Plymouth, beginning with a question describing different types of multi-family housing such as duplexes and apartments. The question then solicited the opinion of respondents as to whether they believed the City of Plymouth currently has *Too many*, *Too few*, or the *Right amount* of multi-family housing units.

As illustrated in the graph below, a strong 58 percent majority of respondents selected the “right amount” answer option.



Subgroups reporting “Too many” in proportions greater than the norm of 17% included:


- 35% *Bike Lanes – Too Many*
- 29% *Parkland Replacement Purchase – No*
- 28% *Allow More Duplexes – Oppose*
- 27% *Age 65+*
- 25% *Parks’ Economic Benefit to Community – Little/None*
- Home Height Ordinance – Decrease*
- 23% *Tree Ordinance – Too Little*
- Residency – 16+ Years*

Subgroups reporting “Too few” in proportions greater than the norm of 17% included:

- 38% *Garage Height Ordinance – Increase*
- 32% *Age 18-34*
- 35% *Bike Lanes – Need More*
- 29% *Landscape Ordinance – Unaware*
- 25% *Home Height Right after COVID? – No*
- Home Height Ordinance – Decrease*

-- Favor/Oppose Duplexes in Single-Family Neighborhoods – Q. 28

After asking respondents about their perception of the sufficiency of the number of multi-family housing units in the city, the interview next inquired of them if they would *Favor* or *Oppose* (with each of these responses having the further modifiers of *Strongly* and *Somewhat* recited as an available response) allowing duplexes to be built in single-family residential neighborhoods. As the graph below illustrates, a majority of respondents registered opposition, with better than half of the overall total being of the *Strongly* oppose variety.



Subgroups reporting "Favor" in proportions greater than the total norm of 37% included:

- 56% Age 18-34
- 54% Garage Height Ordinance – Increase
- 50% Allow ADUs – Favor
- 48% Bike Lanes – Need More
- 48% Multi-Family Housing – More
- 43% Visited PARC – No
- 42% Recreation Participation – Respondent
- 42% Info Source – Direct Mail
- 42% Residency – 6-15 Years
- 41% Tonquish – Unaware


Subgroups reporting "Oppose" in proportions greater than the total norm of 52% included

- 72% Allow ADUs – Oppose
- 67% Parks Enhance Home Values – Little/Not at all
- 64% Bike Lanes – Too Many
- 62% Age 65+
- 62% Residency 1-5 Years
- 60% Bike Lanes – Enough
- 59% Age 50-64
- 58% Bike Racks – Enough
- 58% Visited Tonquish – No
- 57% Recreation Participation – HH Members
- 57% Visited Don Massey – No
- 57% Multi-Family Housing – About Right
- 57% Home Sizes Right after COVID? – Yes
- 57% Garage Height Ordinance – Don't Change

-- Favor/Oppose 2nd Level Garage ADU – Q. 28

After providing a description of accessory dwelling units – including their utilization as long and short-term rentals – solicitation of *Favor* or *Oppose* to the city allowing this type of dwelling to be established on the second level of detached garages was made to respondents. For further refinement of the responses, if a respondent reported "Favor" or "Oppose", a gradation of intensity of the sentiment was asked to be assigned in the form of, *Strongly* or *Somewhat*.

As is illustrated in the graph below, there is a strong majority support for the proposition of allowing ADU's as described, although, as a proportion of the respective totals, proponents express their sentiment more intensely than do those who oppose the proposition.



Subgroups reporting "Favor" in proportions greater than the total norm of 59% included:


- 81% Allow More Duplexes – Favor
- 73% Visited Art Studio – Yes
- 68% Age 18-34
- 67% Residency – 6-15 Years
- 66% Visited Tonquish – Yes
- 65% Home Height Right after COVID? – No
- Landscape Ordinance – Unaware
- Age 35-49
- 64% Parkland Replacement Purchase – Yes
- Bike Lanes – Too Many
- Tree Ordinance – Too Little
- Landscape Ordinance – Too Little
- 63% Home Height Ordinance – Decrease

Subgroups reporting "Oppose" in proportions greater than the total norm of 37% included:

- 45% Age 50-64
- 43% Bike Lanes – Enough
- 42% Parks Enhance Home Values – Little/Not at all
- Bike Lanes – Enough
- Visited Tonquish – No
- Home Size Ordinance – Decrease

-- Size and Mass of Single-Family Homes Since COVID – Q. 29

Using March of 2020 as a frame of reference, respondents were asked – after being informed that the city has ordinances controlling their mass and size – if the homes built in the city since the designated calendar point of the COVID onset have been appropriately sized. The graph below illustrates the nearly even split in opinion regarding this question:



Subgroups reporting “Yes” in proportions greater than the total norm of 46% included:

- 72% Home Size Ordinance – Keep the Same
- 69% Residency – 1-5 Years
- 61% Home Height Right after COVID? – Yes
- 59% Tonquish – Unaware
- 58% Garage Height Ordinance – Increase
- 56% Bike Racks – Enough
- Visited Don Massey – Yes
- 55% Visited Private Art Studio – Yes
- Home Height Ordinance – Keep the Same
- Garage Height Right after COVID – Yes
- 54% Landscape Ordinance – Enough
- 52% Bike Lanes – Enough
- Multi-Family Housing – About Right
- 51% Visited Private Gym – Yes
- Allow More Duplexes – Oppose
- Garage Height Ordinance – Keep the Same


Subgroups reporting “No” in proportions greater than the total norm of 48% included:

- 94% Home Size Ordinance – Decrease
- 85% Home Height Ordinance – Decrease
- 83% Home Height Right after COVID? – No
- 66% Bike Lanes – Too Many
- 64% Landscape Ordinance – Too Little
- 57% Age 65+
- 56% Tonquish – Unaware
- Multi-Family Housing – More
- 54% Recreation Participation – HH Members
- Age 50-64
- Residency – 16+ Years
- 53% Bike Racks – Need More
- Visited Tonquish – Yes
- Visited PARC – Yes
- Visited Private Gym – Yes

-- Citizen Opinion About Home Mass & Size Ordinance – Q. 30

The next housing-related question asked respondents to select which of three recited options regarding the size and mass of single-family homes the existing Plymouth City ordinance allows. The response options offered were to – *Increase*, *Decrease*, or *Not change* – the existing

ordinance’s size and mass specifications. One-half of respondents opted for the status quo, with slightly under four-in-ten expressing a preference for a decrease in the size and mass specifications. The following chart illustrates the distribution of responses:



Subgroups reporting “Decrease” in proportions greater than the total norm of 37% included:


- 72% Home Sizes Right after COVID? – No
- 67% Home Height Right after COVID? – No
- 61% Landscape Ordinance – Too Little
- 47% Recreation Participation – HH Members
- 46% Multi-Family Housing – Need More
- Tree Ordinance – Too Little
- 44% Visited Tonquish – Yes
- Children at Home? – Yes
- Age 35-49
- 43% Tonquish – Aware
- Bike Lanes – Too Many
- Bike Racks – More
- 42% Visited School Playground – Yes

Subgroups reporting “Don’t change” in proportions greater than the total norm of 50% included:

- 79% Home Sizes Right after COVID? – Yes
- 74% Residency – 1-5 Years
- 64% Home Height Right after COVID? – Yes
- Home Height Ordinance – Keep the Same
- 61% Tonquish – Aware
- 60% Age 18-34
- 59% Tree Ordinance – Too Much
- 58% Parks Enhance Home Values – Little/Not at all
- 57% Multi-Family Housing – About Right
- Garage Height Right after COVID – Yes
- 56% Bike Racks – Enough
- Visited School Playground – No
- Tree Ordinance – Enough
- Landscape Ordinance – Enough
- 55% Visited Cultural Center – No
- Visited PARC – No
- Garage Height Ordinance – Increase
- Tree Ordinance – Enough
- 54% Visited Tonquish – No

-- Height of Single-Family Homes Since COVID – Q. 31

In a reprise of the question regarding new home mass and size constructed since March of 2020, respondents were asked – after being informed that the city has ordinances controlling the height of single family homes – if the homes built in the city since the COVID onset have been of the appropriate height. The graph below illustrates the distribution of responses to this question about the height of homes built since March of 2020:



Subgroups reporting “Yes” in proportions greater than the total norm of 66% included:


- 89% Home Height Ordinance – Keep the Same
- 87% Home Sizes Right after COVID? – Yes
- 84% Home Size Ordinance – Keep the Same
- 80% Age 18-34
- 79% Visited Private Art Studio – Yes
- Garage Height Right after COVID – Yes
- Residency – 1-5 Years
- 77% Garage Height Ordinance – Increase
- 76% Landscape Ordinance – Enough
- 74% Parks’ Economic Benefit to Community – Little/None
- Visited Don Massey – Yes
- Garage Height Ordinance – Keep the Same
- 73% Tonquish – Aware
- Bike Racks – Enough
- 72% Multi-Family Housing – About Right
- 71% Allow ADUs – Oppose
- Tree Ordinance – Enough
- Residency – 6-15 Years

Subgroups reporting “No” in proportions greater than the total norm of 31% included:

- 93% Home Height Ordinance – Decrease
- 56% Home Size Ordinance – Decrease
- 53% Home Sizes Right after COVID? – No
- 47% Landscape Ordinance – Unaware
- 41% Multi-Family Housing – More
- Landscape Ordinance – Too Little
- 39% Age 65+
- 37% Tree Ordinance – Too Little
- 36% Parks Enhance Home Values – Little/Not at all

-- Citizen Opinion About Home Height Ordinance – Q. 32

As with the earlier question about the ordinance specifying the allowed mass and size of homes, respondents were asked whether the city’s home height ordinance should allow an increase or decrease in home heights, or if the ordinance’s specifications should remain the same. Just under two-thirds of respondents reported a desire that the ordinance remain unchanged.



Subgroups reporting “Decrease” in proportions greater than the total norm of 23% included:

- 71% Garage Height Right after COVID – No
- 70% Home Height Right after COVID? – No
- 47% Home Size Ordinance – Decrease
- 40% Home Sizes Right after COVID? – No
- 38% Landscape Ordinance – Too Little
- 33% Multi-Family Housing – Need More
- Tree Ordinance – Too Little
- 31% Landscape Ordinance – Unaware
- Age 50-64
- Age 65+
- Residency – 16+ Years
- 29% Bike Lanes – Need More
- 28% Bike Racks – Need More
- 27% Tonquish – Aware
- 25% Children at Home? – No


Subgroups reporting “Don’t change” in proportions greater than the total norm of 65% included:

- 87% Home Heights Right after COVID? – Yes
- 83% Home Size Ordinance – Keep the Same
- 81% Residency – 1-5 Years
- 79% Garage Height Ordinance – Keep the Same
- 78% Home Sizes Right after COVID? – Yes
- 76% Landscape Ordinance – Enough
- 75% Garage Height Right after COVID – Yes
- 74% Multi-Family Housing – About Right
- 73% Age 35-49
- 72% Visited Private Art Studio – Yes
- Age 18-34
- 71% Bike Racks – Enough
- Children at Home? – Yes

- 70% Allow ADUs – Oppose
- Tree Ordinance – Enough
- 69% Visited Tonquish – Yes

-- Height of Detached Garages Since COVID – Q. 33

In the final pair of questions addressing residential construction ordinance specifications, respondents were asked – after being informed that the city has ordinances controlling the height of detached garages – if the detached garages built in the city since the onset of the pandemic in March of 2020 have been of the appropriate height. The graph below illustrates the distribution of responses:



Subgroups reporting “Yes” in proportions greater than the total norm of 76% included:

- 96% Age 18-34
- 91% Visited Private Art Studio – Yes
- Home Sizes Right after COVID? – Yes
- 90% Home Heights Right after COVID? – Yes
- 88% Garage Height Ordinance – Increase
- Garage Height Ordinance – Keep the Same
- 87% Home Height Ordinance – Keep the Same
- 86% Home Size Ordinance – Keep the Same
- 84% Residency – 1-5 Years
- 83% Bike Racks – Enough
- Visited Don Massey – Yes
- 82% Landscape Ordinance -- Enough
- 81% Recreation Participation – HH Members
- Children at Home? – Yes
- Residency – 6-15 Years
- 80% Visited Private Gym – Yes
- Tree Ordinance -- Enough


Subgroups reporting “No” in proportions greater than the total norm of 13% included:

- 41% Home Height Ordinance – Decrease
- 36% Home Heights Right after COVID? – No
- 26% Home Size Ordinance – Decrease
- 24% Home Sizes Right after COVID? – No
- 23% Landscape Ordinance – Too Little
- 22% Age 50-64

- 19% *Bike Lanes – Too many*
Residency – 16+ Years
- 17% *Multi-Family Housing – Need More*
Age 65+

-- Citizen Opinion About Garage Height Ordinance – Q. 34

As with the earlier questions about the ordinance specifying the allowed mass, size and height of homes, respondents were asked whether the city’s detached height ordinance should allow an increase or decrease in garage heights, or if the ordinance’s specifications should remain the same. An even two-thirds of respondents reported a desire that the ordinance remain unchanged.



Subgroups reporting “Increase” in proportions greater than the total norm of 16% included:



- 36% *Age 18-34*
- 29% *Residency – 1-5 Years*
- 24% *Bike Lanes – Need More*
Multi-Family Housing – Need More
- 23% *Allow More Duplexes – Favor*
Allow ADUs – Favor
- 22% *Landscape Ordinance – Enough*
- 21% *Bike Lanes – Too Many*
- 20% *Bike Racks – Enough*
Visited Tonquish – Yes
Home Sizes Right after COVID? – Yes

Subgroups reporting “Decrease” in proportions greater than the total norm of 10% included:

- 34% *Home Height Ordinance – Decrease*
- 26% *Home Heights Right after COVID? – No*
- 23% *Home Size Ordinance – Decrease*
- 22% *Bike Lanes – Too Many*
Landscape Ordinance – Too Little
- 19% *Home Sizes Right after COVID? – No*
- 18% *Tree Ordinance – Too Little*
- 16% *Age 50-64*
- 15% *Allow ADUs – Oppose*
Residency – 16+ Years


Subgroups reporting "Don't change" in proportions greater than the total norm of 66% included:

- 80% Home Height Ordinance – Keep the Same
- 77% Garage Height Right after COVID – Yes
- 76% Recreation Participation – HH Members Attended a Private Art Studio – Yes
- 74% Home Heights Right after COVID? – Yes
- 73% Allow ADUs – Oppose
- Home Size Ordinance – Keep the Same
- 72% Bike Lanes – Enough
- Allow More Duplexes – Oppose
- Home Sizes Right after COVID? – Yes
- 71% Multi-Family Housing – About Right
- Children at Home? – Yes
- 70% Bike Racks – More Needed



-- Perception of Effect of Plymouth’s Tree Ordinance – Q. 35

Respondents were informed that the city had adopted an ordinance in 2017 aimed at protecting, preserving, and reforesting the tree canopy. They were asked to report whether this ordinance had done *Enough*, *Too little*, or *Too much*, in achieving the stated aim. As the graph below shows, a plurality of respondents reported the ordinance has done “enough”, nearly three-in-ten reporting “too little”, with five percent volunteering (a non-recited response option) that they were unaware of the ordinance.



Subgroups reporting “Too little” in proportions greater than the total norm of 29% included:

- 48% Info Source – Website
- 45% Landscape Ordinance – Too Little
- 41% Visited Private Art Studio – Yes
- Home Height Ordinance – Decrease
- Landscape Ordinance – Unaware
- 40% Age 50-64
- 37% Multi-Family Housing – Need More
- Residency – 16+ Years
- 36% Visited School Playground – Yes
- Home Size Ordinance – Decrease
- 35% Home Heights Right after COVID? – No
- 34% Bike Racks – Need More
- 36% Visited Tonquish – Yes
- 33% Bike Lanes – Need More
- Visited Cultural Center – Yes
- Visited PARC – Yes

Subgroups reporting “Enough” in proportions greater than the total norm of 48% included:

- 68% Landscape Ordinance – Enough
- Age 18-34
- 58% Home Height Ordinance – Increase
- 57% Visited Don Massey – Yes
- Info Source – Direct Mail
- Residency – 1-5 Years


- 56% *Garage Height Ordinance – Increase*
- 55% *Tonquish – Unaware*
- 54% *Visited Cultural Center – No*
Multi-Family Housing – About Right
Home Size Ordinance – Keep the Same
Residency – 6-15 Years
- 53% *Visited Private Gym – No*
- 52% *Bike Lanes – Need More*
Visited PARC – No

Subgroups reporting “Too much” in proportions greater than the total norm of 10% included:

- 22% *Parks’ Economic Benefit to Community – Little/None*
- 18% *Bike Lanes – Too Many*
- 17% *Age 65+*
- 14% *Parks Enhance Home Values – Little/Not at all*
Bike Racks – Enough

-- Perception of Effect of Plymouth’s Landscape Ordinance – Q. 35

Respondents were informed that the city had adopted a 2023 ordinance establishing a minimum square footage of landscaped area on all residential properties. They were asked to report whether this ordinance had done *Enough*, *Too little*, or *Too much*, to protect and enhance the landscaped areas of the city. As the graph below shows, a plurality of respondents again reported the ordinance has done “enough”, with slightly lower proportions than in the previous question logging responses of “too much” or “too little”. The decline in those latter two categories is made up in the volunteered response of “unaware”, which in this instance found 18 percent being unaware of this ordinance.



Subgroups reporting “Too little” in proportions greater than the total norm of 21% included:

- 36% *Garage Height Right after COVID – No*
- 35% *Home Size Ordinance – Decrease*
Home Height Ordinance – Decrease

- 34% *Tree Ordinance – Too Little*
- 32% *Residency – 6-15 Years*
- 31% *Age 35-49*
- 29% *Bike Lanes – Need More*
Visited Tonquish – Yes
Visited School Playground – Yes
- 28% *Recreation Participation – HH Members*
Info Source – Direct Mail
Home Sizes Right after COVID? – No
Home Heights Right after COVID? – No
- 27% *Bike Racks – Need More*
Visited Private Gym – No
- 26% *Tonquish – Aware*
- 25% *Visited PARC – Yes*
Info Source – Email
Children at Home? – Yes

Subgroups reporting “Enough” in proportions greater than the total norm of 42% included:

- 62% *Residency – 6-15 Years*
- 59% *Tree Ordinance – Enough*
- 58% *Garage Height Ordinance – Increase*
- 51% *Bike Racks – Enough*
- 49% *Visited School Playground – No*
- 48% *Home Sizes Right after COVID? – Yes*
Home Heights Right after COVID? – Yes
Home Height Ordinance – Keep the Same
Age 18-34
- 47% *Tonquish – Unaware*
Bike Lanes – Too Many
- 46% *Visited Don Massey – Yes*
Visited Private Gym – Yes
Home Size Ordinance – Keep the Same

Subgroups reporting “Unaware” in proportions greater than the total norm of 19% included:

- 28% *Home Heights Right after COVID? – No*
- 26% *Tree Ordinance – Too Little*
- 25% *Parks Enhance Home Values – Little/Not at all*
Home Height Ordinance – Decrease
- 24% *Multi-Family Housing – Need More*
Residency – 16+ Years

RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

Do you currently have school age children, 18 years old or younger, living in your household?

- 33% Yes
- 67% No
- 0% Undecided/Refused

Are you currently registered to vote in the City of Plymouth?

- 98% Yes
- 2% No
- 0% Undecided/Refused

Could you please tell me in what year you were born? [IF REFUSED, ASK: 'Would you please tell me into which of the following categories your age would fall? Please stop me when I get to a category that applies to you.' **AND READ 1 TO 4**]

[RECORD YEAR HERE ____ AND THEN CODE BELOW]

- 22% 18 to 34 years (1989 to 2005)
- 24% 35 to 49 (1974 to 1988)
- 29% 50 to 64 (1959 to 1973)
- 25% 65 and over (1958 or before)
- Undecided/Refused

For how many years have you lived in the City of Plymouth? **[DO NOT READ - CODE BEST RESPONSE]**

- 16% 5 years or less
- 31% 6 to 15 years
- 47% Over 16 years
- 6% All of their life (VOLUNTEERED)
- 0% Undecided/Refused

#####


CITY OF PLYMOUTH RECREATION DEPARTMENT MASTER PLAN ONLINE SURVEY RESULTS

Open on-line for public input from Sept. 18 – 27, 2023

Question 1.

In what city or township do you reside?


371 responses



Question 2.

How much of an economic benefit do you believe that Recreational Activities, Special Events and Parks provide to the Plymouth Community? Would you say...


371 responses



Question 3.

How much do you believe that maintained parks and green spaces enhance the property values of homes in the Plymouth Community? Would you say...


371 responses



Question 4.

Tonquish Creek Park and Nature Area, located in the City of Plymouth, before today, would you say you were...


371 responses



Question 5.

Recently, due to the school district's need to repurpose some green space, the City of Plymouth's Recreation Department has lost activity space that in turn has required a reduction in some youth sports programming. Generally speaking, would you be in favor of the purchase of vacant land by the City at a future date in order to create new parks and restore recreational program offerings?

371 responses



Question 6.


If additional funding became available for the City to use to develop a new park, what park amenities would you like to see included?

(See text answer summary after pie chart graph questions)

Question 7.

Do you or any members of your household participate in a Recreational or Athletic Program organized by a League or Association?

371 responses



Question 8.

What Recreational or Athletic Program(s) do you or other members of your household participate in?

(See text answer summary after pie chart graph questions)

Question 9.


What new Activities, Recreational or Athletic Programs, or Leagues would you like to see offered in the City that are not currently offered?

(See text answer summary after pie chart graph questions)

Question 10.

In your opinion, are there enough, too many, or too few bicycle lanes located throughout the city?


371 responses



Question 11.

If you answered "Too few" to the previous question, do you think many more, or just some more, are needed?

371 responses



Question 12.


On what streets would you like to see additional bike lanes located?

(See text answer summary after pie chart graph questions)

Question 13.

In your opinion, are there enough, too many, or too few bicycle racks located throughout the city?


371 responses



Question 14.


If you answered "Too few" to the previous question, do you think many more, or just some more, are needed?

371 responses



Question 15.

Below is a list of recreational facilities in the City of Plymouth. For each, please tell me if you or any other members of your household have visited that facility within the past year




Locations in order on graph:

1. Hines Park
2. Tonquish Creek Park
3. Kellogg Park
4. Plymouth Cultural Center
5. P.A.R.C.
6. Don Massey Field
7. Any school playground or gymnasium
8. Any commercially owned fitness center or gym
9. Any commercially owned dance studio
10. Any commercially owned art studio
11. Any City Neighborhood Park

Question 16.

What is your preferred method(s) of receiving information regarding Recreational or Special Events in the Plymouth Community?


371 responses



Question 17.

Do you currently have school age children, 18 years old or younger, living in your household?


371 responses



Question 18.

Are you currently registered to vote in the City of Plymouth?


371 responses



Question 19.

What year were you born?


371 responses



Question 20.

For how many years have you lived in the City of Plymouth

371 responses



Question 21.

Do you have any additional input for the Recreation Master Plan?

(See text answer summary after pie chart graph questions)

Text answer input

Question 6.

If additional funding became available for the City to use to develop a new park, what park amenities would you like to see included?

A dog park would be nice, a natural green space without a lot of play areas...we have a lot of small kiddie parks

A dog park!!!

A dog park.

A dog run

A park for teens, perhaps a skate park or outdoor roller skate park. We have plenty of parks for children but nothing for the teenagers.

A public pool! Many of many neighbors talk about how much we wish Plymouth had a public pool. Would be a HUGE addition to the city. I would also like to see an outdoor ice skating rink in the winter.

accessibility for people with disabilities

ADA approved play area for children

Amenities particularly for young children and families, and seating and activities for older adults

Amphitheater

an area for pets

An interactive natural beauty area landscaped to attract a variety of birds, butterflies, etc... this would be beneficial to all for learning and as an example for homeowners wishing to transform their property.

An outdoor ice skating rink would be fun. Would love to see a park with activities that vary based on the season (like Campus Martius).

Any additional funding should go towards fixing the roads, for example Harvey between Wing and AA Trail.

anything

Area for kids sporting events that are multi use - soccer, etc. and playground area.

asphalt-paved running trails

athletic clubs for children; exercise space for adults

Athletic fields

Attractive landscaping.

barbeque pavilions (covered)

Baseball / soccer fields, playgrounds, outdoor physical fitness equipment

Basketball and tennis courts, baseball and football/soccer fields

basketball courts, public pool, skateboard park

Basketball courts, soccer field

Basketball quart

Bathrooms

BATHROOMS!

Benches

benches

Benches & Picnic tables

Benches and picnic tables, and trash containers.

Benches for seating for, especially, senior citizens.

Benches with backs, small tables near the benches, less emphasis on children's play areas and more emphasis on quiet areas. Lawn mowers and leaf blowers disturb the quiet areas in the city.

Better playground equipment, basketball court, pickle ball court, soccer fields, tennis courts (or redo the ones at PARC)....and dream scenario would be a public pool!

Bike path

Biking & Hiking Trails

Bouldering, mountain bike skills, skateboarding, pickleball

children's playscape

Children's recreational league areas

City pool

Climbing walls, outdoor exercise/kinestetics, nature trails

Comfortable seating, play structures for children

Community garden

Community pool

Community pool, courts, skate park

Corn hole, pavilion, grill, restrooms

Dedicated soccer fields for game and practice. Basketball courts.

Disc Golf, outdoor fitness equipment, sprayscape/splash pad, and dog park

Dog friendly options

Dog friendly walking trails, pollinator gardens, amphitheater

Dog friendly, water feature, floral presence, shaded areas

Dog park

Dog park

Dog park

Dog park

Dog park

Dog park

Dog park

Dog park

Dog park and skate park for the kids

Dog park in addition to what is needed to supplement kid's play spaces.

Dog park or dog friendly space, benches, gardens, trails

Dog park so we dog owners don't have to go into canton or northville

Dog park(s) and/or dog-friendly park(s), restrooms, drinking fountains.

Dog park, pickle ball courts, pool

Dog park, tennis courts, gardens

dog park, walking trails

dog waste station, playground, volleyball nets, pickleball or tennis courts

Don't support the tax increase. many other areas need addressing.

Environmentally friendly playground

First, complete the Kellogg Park improvements; I would like to see an all-inclusive playground and walking or biking trails.

fountains informative statues (i.e., the one in front of the Wilcox House)

General fitness amenities (running trail/track), or bicycle trails

Green space and sidewalks

Green space, trees, playground

grills,

Gym - outdoor pool - pickle ball

Handicapped accessible

Hiking trails, restrooms, drinking fountains

Hiking trails, sitting areas, splash pads, native plants, bike path accessibility

How about some exercise equipment specifically for seniors as seen in Asian communities

I do not support adding infrastructure if the Township is not contributing. Must be joint. We are too small to do it alone.

I guess it depends on the area.

I like it how it is. No changes required.

I think green space is extremely important, I wish the city would feel so too. The city unfortunately chooses to continue to build on every "green" space there is left in this once beautiful city.

I want to see weekend open skating returned to the cultural center. This is ridiculous we have a facility in the city of plymouth that taxpayers support with zero access. You did away with figure skating there years ago and now families can't even open skate?

I would not support funding through additional residential property taxes.

I would prefer you lower our taxes.

ice skating rink

I'm an older adult, not sure, but I support play areas for people of all ages & abilities.

Indoor and/or outdoor pool where my daughter could take swimming lessons and I could do water aerobics

Isolated dog park, soccer fields, jogging track

Key entry and membership only of City residents, for a dog park

Kid playground equipment

Lots of multi use green space, walking/bike trails

Mixed use - walking, workout area, play structure, etc.

More baseball fields and green space

More soccer and baseball fields.

Mountain Biking or Street Hockey would be fun

Multi-Use fields and pickleball

Native gardens with larval host plants for butterflies & walking paths

Native plants, trees, walking/hiking trails, restrooms, dog bags, roller hockey rinks

Natural areas, soccer fields, pickleball courts

Natural/unmowed space

Nature trail improvements on Tonquish creek and better pedestrian connections and signage between city land and Hines Drive county parkland.

nature walk paths

Nice tennis courts with lights for play at night

no

No answer at this time

No opinion.

no playgrounds

None

None

none

None if I will be taxed.

None, the City can not even pick up the brush. The City needs to focus on "needs", not wants or more fiefdom building.

Only interested if the park is officially smoke, vape, and marijuana free

Outdoor and indoor Pickleball courts.

Outdoor aquatic center

Outdoor pool

Outdoor pool

Park similar to Westland newest park or more kids rec sports

Park would accommodate sports fields and play structures

Parking lot with shuttle

Passive green space, community gardens, native pollinator gardens, rain gardens

Paved walkways

pavilion in Fairground Park

Pet friendly walking paths

Pétanque court

pickel ball, dog park, running track

Pickelball

Pickle Ball

Pickle ball counts

Pickle ball court(s)

Pickle ball courts

pickle ball courts

Pickle Ball Courts

Pickle ball courts

Pickle ball courts (growing in popularity), green space.

Pickle ball courts, tennis courts

Pickle ball courts, trees planted close enough for hammocks, maybe a pavilion. And depending on the purpose or target audience of the park, a children's playground is always appreciated by parents of little ones

Pickle ball courts, walking trails, butterfly garden

Pickle ball, a rec center (like the summit or Livonia), a public pool.

Pickle ball, dog park

pickle ball, soccer fields, natural areas

Pickle ball, tennis courts, and roller hockey

Pickleball

Pickleball

Pickleball

Pickleball

Pickleball

Pickleball

Pickleball

pickleball

Pickleball

Pickleball courts

pickleball courts

Pickleball courts

Pickleball courts

Pickleball courts

Pickleball courts

Pickleball courts

Pickleball courts

Pickleball courts

Pickleball, bathrooms

Pickleball, more bike lanes and trails,

Pickleball, soccer, dog park

Pickleball, soccer, running track

Picnic tables and benches

Picnic tables, swings

Picnic tables/playground equipment./ dog park

Play scapes, benches, fountain

Play structure for children

playground

Playground pickleball

Playgrounds, splash pads, softball fields

Pool

Pool

pool, Splash pad, outdoor ice rink, pickleball

Public grill and pavilion, working drinking fountains both for pets and humans.

Public pool, disc golf

Public Pool, ice rink, outdoor track

Public sports fields

Pure greenery. Bench's, tables, trees, etc. peace!! From the ridiculous crowds downtown

Quiet sitting areas. seating with backs to facilitate reading, visiting with friends

Rec building with pool and lazy River

Recreation center (gym, basketball, racquetball, etc).

Rest rooms

Restrooms and tables or benches

restrooms, drinking fountain, accessible equipment

Revenue generation such as concessions, sports shop, as well as restrooms

Sand box

Shaded swings, public pool, splash pad, squishy turf (no mulch), pavilion with benches, bathrooms, playscape, toddler playscape

Skateboard park, outdoor hockey rinks, tennis courts, pickle ball courts,

small children play structures

Small pavilion for inclement weather events

Soccer fields (11v11), pavilions. Online pavilion and event space rental capabilities

Soccer fields, a splash pad, areas that could be rented for picnics and events

Soccer fields, new playground

soccer fields, playgrounds, pickle ball courts, basketball courts

Soccer pitch, benches, walking paths

soccer, pickleball

Soccer, pickleball, corn hole, shaded picnic area,

Socially distanced options, accessible play structures, water bottle filling stations

Some or all of at least the most used equipment now in or parks. Survey other nearby city parks for potential equipment inclusion.

Sports fields, playground structures/equipment, walking paths

Sports fields, restrooms, playgrounds

Sports fields, Skate park, Dog Park

Sports fields, walking trails, benches

Swimming Pool, Dog Park, Multi-Use Courts

tables and shade

Tennis court

The city should focus on maintaining the current parks they have today before spending money to purchase new parks. Why did residents paying an incredible amount of taxes have to form a group, raise money, and improve Fairground Park? Why is the city neglecting the parks? Garden Club Park's playscape has been broken with caution tape on it for over 4 months. Other play items are falling apart. Why is the city neglecting this? When will it be fixed? EYESORES are everywhere in a community of \$500K+ homes. Lower economic communities have nicer parks than Plymouth. Plymouth deserves better management and care of the parks they have before investing in more.

The only park we use is Kellogg Park

Tire swing. Swing set. Picnic tables some covered some now.

Toilet facilities

Trails for walking, bike path

Trees grass benches tables water paths. A place to be.

Trees grass places to sit.

Trees!!

Trees, benches maybe tables for picnic

Trees, grass, playground equipment

Updated playscapes and landscaping, updated or additional amenities for mixed use i.e. reading, picnics, make parks more accessible for handicapped individuals. Planting or replanting of trees that provide maximal canopy + habitat for native species with minimum disruption to streets and power infrastructure. Fixes to existing parks i.e. working water fountains for people/pets, new trash cans where needed and updated lighting that is attractive and energy efficient.

Walking and biking trails along with some gardens.

Walkable space, trees

walking and bicycling trails

walking path

Walking path. (Public restrooms if this is going to be a place for a lot of sports games will be played)

walking paths

Walking paths

Walking paths

Walking paths

walking paths

Walking paths

Walking paths and park benches

Walking paths and pickleball courts (indoor and outdoor)

Walking paths excluding bicycles, scooters, roller blades

walking paths that allow dog walking on leashes

Walking trails

Walking trails with trees and greenery

Walking trails, fitness structures, kids swings and structures

Walking trails.

Walking/exercise stations

Walking/running track

Picnic tables -- covered and uncovered

Outdoor exercise station for adults (like at Gunsolly Mills area in Hines Park)

Water activities, pavilion access, keeping broken things fixed.

Water available

Water Fountains, electrical hook up

We have plenty of Parks and PARC to use.

We need more soccer fields. We are the only city that does not have a designated park for fields. And it is unacceptable that we have had to cut teams because of the shortage. Soccer is such a big sport in our area.

we would love to have a community pool - similar to Ann Arbor

Whatever is needed based on the city of Plymouth's rec Dept based in demand.

Work-out stations along a walking trail

Would like to see special events at parks like art walks and local street musicians on the weekends or food trucks and special events.

Youth Sports only

Youth sports, restrooms. I don't want non-residents weighing in on this question. They don't pay taxes here to be able to dictate how my tax dollars are spent.

Question 8.

What Recreational or Athletic Program(s) do you or other members of your household participate in?

Anytime Fitness/Novi
baseball, flag football, dance, theater, fitness
Baseball, soccer, basketball
basketball
basketball
biking
Bowling/shuffleboard (table)
Children's soccer league
City youth soccer program, city youth basketball program
Community Education golf
Community parks, PARC activities, Cultural Center, tennis,
Corn hols league, youth hockey
Cornhole league
cornhole, fitness classes
Cornhole, trivia, pickleball
Council on aging
Current: Open Skate. In the past, youth soccer, T-Ball, and "learn to play hockey" events.
currently a member of three running clubs
cycling and ice hockey
DCFC/Canton Soccer Club Travel Soccer, PCCS middle school cross country, PCCS CEBL
Downpup yoga and pickleball at the PARC
Euchre, trivia. Skating lessons and other children's activities a long time ago when daughter was younger.
Exercise class; walking
exercise classes at Cultural Center
Exercise programs
fitness classes & currently taking classes @ Schoolcraft College, not offered in Plymouth
Football, basketball, La cross
Gardening/ landscaping, robotics
Golf

golf

Golf

Golf

Golf

Golf and physical fitness

golf league

golf pickleball

Golf, bike riding, tennis

golf, hockey

Golf, Pickle Ball.

Golf, tennis, pickle ball

Grandkids play

gym

Gym, Yoga, Pickleball

Hockey

Hockey

Hockey

Hockey and golf

Hockey and soccer

Hockey North America, Plymouth Cornhole League

hockey, soccer

I haven't participated in any yet because my child is not old enough, or the date and times usually don't work for me. But I have acquaintances that do benefit from these recreational offerings.

I would participate in pickleball.

I've done fitness classes, dog training, trivia night

Kids soccer

Lacrosse, baseball, volleyball, softball, golf

Mt Bike rides with Motor City MTB Assoc

My son did participate in Soccer until the city had to cancel a league for his age group this year (due to the lack of space) now he plays on a Canton Rec team.

N/A

N/A

N/a

n/a

N/A

n/a

N/A

N/A

N/A

NA

na

NA

nature walks

No organized programs

none

None

None

None

None

none

none

None

None

None

none

None

none

none

none

None

None

None

None

none

none

None

None

None

None (previously soccer)

none at present, soccer in the past.

None at the moment

None at this time, but in the past my child participated in soccer through Plymouth rec.

none at this time.

None in the city/township

None. When our kids were young they played rec soccer

Nothing current. Previously youth soccer, corn hole, basketball

Nothing within the city other than biking, walking, Friday concerts but I think organized activities are important to the community. Our son grew up participating in youth sports here.

Nothing within the city.

PARC

pickelball

Pickle ball

Pickle ball, cycling ,ice skating, golf

Pickleball

Pickleball

Pickleball at PARC

Pickleball in the ice rink this summer

Pickleball league and trivia (is that considered "recreational?" It's fun

Pickleball, soccer

Pickleball, swing dance

Plymouth Reign Soccer, summer indoor pickleball at cultural center

Plymouth soccer and hockey programs

Plymouth Soccer Rec

Pool

rec soccer

Reign soccer, previously rec soccer, pickleball

Running, bicycling, kayaking, hiking, paddle boarding

Running, Tennis, Biking

Sailboat racing, National Ski Patrol

Senior hockey

Senior softball and pickleball

Skate park

soccer

Soccer

Soccer

Soccer

Soccer

soccer

Soccer

Soccer

Soccer
soccer
soccer and lacrosse
Soccer and TBall
Soccer baseball pickleball
Soccer, Baseball, Hockey, and Dance
Soccer, baseball, hockey, basketball
Soccer, basketball
Soccer, basketball
Soccer, basketball
soccer, hockey
Soccer, hockey
soccer, pickleball
soccer, pickleball
Soccer, running, cycling
Soccer, swimming
Soccer, tball
Soccer, TBall
Soccer, Volleyball, and Lacrosse
Soccer-adult rec league
softball, hockey
Some exercise classes
Son plays baseball in college, but used city facilities
for years in the past.
Special Olympics
Sports
Summer indoor pickleball
Summer Pickleball League at Plymouth Cultural
Center
Swim
Tai Chi
Tai Chi and Pickleball
Tball
T-ball
t-ball, soccer, fitness classes
Tee ball
tennis
Tennis/Pickleball.
Theater
Travel soccer

Trivia Night - multiple times

Trivia

Trivia, soccer, tai chi

Walking

Walking

Walking

walking and gardening

walking indoors

Walking, birdwatching

Walking, biking, golfing

We go to the health club Planet Fitness

We have participated in soccer and T-ball in the past.

We play tennis at the arts park area

We took a tai chi class

We used to participate in soccer for many years but my daughter is too old now.

We want to join a pickle ball group

weight lifting / swimming

When my children are old enough, they will participate in recreational activities (within the next two years).

Workout classes

Workout classes, basketball, lacrosse, volleyball, football.

Yoga

Yoga, soccer and lacrosse

Yoga, walking

youth basketball and volleyball, adult volleyball

Youth soccer

Youth soccer

Youth soccer

Youth soccer, youth baseball.

Youth sports

Youth sports, yoga classes, personal training, walking, dog walking

Question 9.

What new Activities, Recreational or Athletic Programs, or Leagues would you like to see offered in the City that are not currently offered?

30-40 minute lunchtime yoga

A recreation center with aquatics etc

Activities and events for seniors

additional hiking/nature trails; adult tennis league;

Adult coed soccer

Adult kickball league

Adult Rec leagues in basketball, tennis, softball/baseball or open gym time for pickup leagues

Adult recreational leagues for things like softball/dodgeball/soccer/etc

Adult soccer, volleyball, public skating (not hockey related)

Adult Tennis

Adult tennis lessons

Adult walking or biking groups, more swimming options on nights and weekends

Adults and youth basketball leagues

Aquatics

Arts and crafts programs

Basketball league, sand volleyball league, tennis league

Basketball, more summer camps

Basketball, so it will get the hoops off the curbs.

Bike path

Bocce Ball

Dog park

easier activities for older people with health issues

Eucre, trivia

Facility that accomodates recreation activities similar to Canton's Summit, Pickle Ball, walking trails,

Field hockey

Fitness Center

Gentile yoga

Golf league and tennis for middle school

Golf leagues where individual players could sign up and play with other individuals

High school level, non school related baseball, tennis leagues.

High-school age basketball program and/or league, climbing walls/bouldering opportunities, high-school and adult indoor volleyball program and/or league

historical city walking tours.

I am not sure

I can't think of anything

I don't know what is currently offered

I know that you offer recreational corn hole games in the summer, and I think that kubbb would be a great summer game that many would pick up on quickly

I would like to see more activities for senior citizens.

Ice skating, summer soccer, tennis, football, hockey

I'd like to see more Boot camp, cross fit type of programs offered after 5pm.

Indoor pickleball, outdoor pool

It would be great if the city allowed more spots for the Plymouth Canton Special Olympics to practice.

Just fix the parks we have. Get rid of wood chips add soft asphalt pads, Water the grass, cut the branches overgrown. Rake the parks to pick up sticks. Just fix what we already have. Our parks are embarrassing.

Lacrosse

lacrosse and paddle ball

Mens Hockey league 30 years up.

More activities for seniors, like Trivia

More athletics to get kids outside and away from screens.

more classes offered for seniors for exercise or recreation ex. dance classes

More open skate at community center

More pickleball

More pickleball

More Pickleball offerings

More senior activities or mixed ages

More senior programs at the cultural center in the day time.

More space for pickleball other than the indoor PARC league

More yoga in different parks as there are too many people in the DTP sessions.

More youth classes

Mountain Biking or Street Hockey would be fun

n/a

N/A

n/a

n/a

N/A

n/a

N/A

NA

No idea.

No response

Non- or low-competition sports/yoga/group activities for teens. There are generally very few physical/recreational opportunities for high school students who just want to learn a sport or engage in physical activity for the fun of it, without the pressure/time commitment of a school or club team. Seems like a possible niche for Parks & Rec to fill!

None

None

None

None

None

None

None

None

none

none

None

None

None

None

None

None, let the parents fund and organize it.

None.

None. I like just sitting in the park

none...mostly provide location to play.

not sure

not sure

Not sure if the City has adequate space to do much at the level it would need to be to be successful.

Not sure right now

Of course pickleball times like northville offers

Off leash Dog park

ok as is

outdoor aquatic center (something more interesting than just a rectangular pool, splash/spray area, slides, lazy river, etc. Huntington Woods is just one example, google has many to use for inspiration). This would further enhance quality of life in plymouth, the waitlist at colony is several years. A municipal outdoor pool could also have a membership system & people would pay for it because they are doing it currently at numerous private facilities. Many programming options, movie night, theme parties, swim lessons, life guard training, ect.

look at emerging trends, climbing wall, pickleball, skatepark, outdoor winter skating ribbon/bike and roller blade at other times, mini golf...think beyond the traditional activities

Outdoor pickleball

Outdoor Pickleball League

Outdoor pool

Outdoor yoga!! I used to do yoga at the cultural center and I miss it very much. We have beautiful green spaces in Plymouth and I wish there were yoga offerings outside.

Pickleball

pickelball courts

pickelball for youth and adults and nice basketball courts

pickle ball

pickle ball

Pickle Ball

pickle ball

Pickle ball

Pickle ball

Pickle ball and tennis

Pickle ball courts

Pickle Ball league

Pickle ball ping pong euchre

pickle ball, soccer

Pickleball

pickleball

Pickleball

Pickleball

Pickleball

Pickleball

Pickleball

Pickleball

Pickleball

Pickleball

Pickleball

Pickleball courts

pickleball courts would be nice

Pickleball I

pickleball league

Pickleball league or drop in recreational times

Pickleball, kickball, adult soccer,

Pickleball, yoga, zumba, adult lap swimming, water aerobics, swim lessons for children

Pilates and yoga

pinocle club

Pool club/team, water polo, gymnastics club

Rollerskating

Senior physical activity mornings.

Senior programs. Like Livonia

Soccer club

Swim

Swim league, volleyball, lacrosse

Swimming

Tai chi

Tennis and pickleball

Tennis lessons please

Tennis lessons,

Tennis, Pickle ball, Youth Soccer for US11 returned!

Ultimate frisbee league, young professional soccer league. More active opportunities for active sports that help people get to know others.

Undecided

Undecided

unknown

Volleyball, lacrosse, flag football

Walking / running paths

Walking clubs, offerings for teens over 13, an arrangement with PARC for municipal open swim, dog park

Water activities, physical fitness

Whiffleball league, adult soccer, stretching and mobility classes (not yoga)

Yoga classes

Yoga, dances for seniors, or couples, not kids. Walking groups during the day.

Youth Dance/Gymnastics

Question 12.

On what streets would you like to see additional bike lanes located?

AA Trail
AAT, Harvey, Main St.
All main streets
All main streets leading from DTP to Hines Drive
All major roads
All major roads. In addition Main Street: Ann Arbor Trail, Harvey, Penniman, Church, Union,
all major streets
All major streets in the city....Penniman, AA Trail, Harvey, etc.
all of Main Street; Farmer
All the way down A2 Trail
Ann arbor road
Ann Arbor road, Ann Arbor trail, Powell, Main
ann arbor road, old village, and connections to hines park
Ann Arbor Road, Sheldon, Farmer, Main Street
Ann Arbor Tr., Penniman, Forest, Would also include a historical bike tour for visitor's and residents
Ann Arbor Trail
ann arbor trail
Ann Arbor trail
Ann Arbor trail
Ann Arbor trail
Ann Arbor trail
Ann Arbor Trail and maybe Penniman
Ann Arbor Trail and Penniman
ann arbor trail and pennimen
Ann Arbor Trail and Sheldon to better connect to West, RedBell, and Bird.
Ann Arbor Trail, Ann Arbor Rd, all of Main St, Sheldon, Beck
Ann Arbor Trail, Harvey Street, Penniman/Church Streets
Ann Arbor Trail, Harvey, Farmer, Junction
Ann Arbor trail, Harvey, penniman

Ann arbor trail, Harvey, penniman

Ann Arbor Trail, I should be able to travel safely on a bike from one end of P to the other

Ann Arbor Trail, Main St

Ann Arbor Trail, Main St., Mill, Starkweather, Farmer

Ann Arbor Trail, Penman

Ann Arbor Trail, Penniman, Blanche.

Ann Arbor Trail, Penniman, Harvey, Starkweather, Mill, Farmer

Ann Arbor trail, Penniman, Union

Ann Arbor Trl

as many as possible

Bike lanes connecting Hines Park to downtown would be helpful

Canton Center Road

Church, Penniman, Harvey, Ann Arbor Trail

Cyclists share the road with cars and our streets should encourage coexistence -- many city streets are so narrow by creating a bike lane would potentially make for more dangerous situations with cars and cyclists. We should prioritize pedestrians, walking is likely the most used mode of transportation in the city following cars.

Deer, Wing, Harvey

Due to the large traffic volume I don't enjoy biking in the city as often as I did.

E. Ann Arbor Trl, Lilley/Mill, Plymouth Rd

Evergreen, MckKinley,

Everywhere

Extended North on Main Street to Mill. Ann Arbor Trail

Farmer

Farmer Sheldon to a Hines park connection.

Farmer, Evergreen, Church, Union, Ann Arbor Trail

Farmer, main street, penniman, mill street, plymouth road - most importantly bike lanes need to be contiguous and connect to destinations; in segments or isolation they are not effective. Need an overall non-motorized plan by a qualified non-motorized specialist, not Wade Trim!

Harvey

Harvey

Harvey

Harvey

Harvey definitely, and the North half of Main, as it's really not safe to ride there at all unless on the sidewalks, which is not allowed and also not safe to pedestrians. Also Farmer, since cars there tend to go *much* faster than the speed limit. Lilly/Mill also. The strictly residential streets are really generally ok to ride without dedicated lanes. All the surrounding county roads too-- Sheldon, Ann Arbor Rd--but I suppose that's not up to the City.

Harvey towards old village, Main street toward old village, Ann Arbor Trail, Starkweather

Harvey, Adams

Harvey, Ann Arbor Trail

Harvey, Ann arbor trail, Lilley, Penniman

Harvey, Ann Arbor trail, main st from mill to town.

Harvey, Main north

Harvey, Main Street, Ann Arbor trail, Ann Arbor road

Harvey, Main, Ann Arbor Trail, Liley, Penniman, Farmer, Old Town

Harvey, McKinley, Lilley/Mill, Penniman, all of Main Street, Ann Arbor Trail

Harvey, Mill, Lilley

Harvey, Mill, Starkweather, Ann Arbor Trail, Farmer

Harvey, Penniman and Ann Arbor Trail

I'd like to see signage directing/encouraging cyclists to stay on roads with bike lanes. It seems dangerous when they are riding on the 2 lane streets that don't have bike lanes, for example Ann Arbor Trail.

I'm not sure but I'm hesitant to ride on any major street

It is uncomfortable biking into downtown from the North (taking Harvey or Main St). It would be nice to see Harvey have a dedicated bike lane, but I understand logistical issues with width.

It's not so much that we need more bike lanes (although that would be great, especially on Penniman and Ann Arbor Trail), it's that we need barriers between the cars and the bikes. I don't feel comfortable using the bike lanes on Main because I'm usually with my kids and I don't believe cars are respectful of our safety.

I've seen 1 person using the Main St bike lane. Total waste of space/money.

Lilley, Olde Village streets

Lilley/ Mill, Ann Arbor Trail - don't get rid of car lanes for bikes like Main St (big mistake)

Lilly, Ann Arbor trail

Main st, Ann Arbor trail, harvey

main st, starkweather, ann arbor trail

main street

Main Street (or parallel street)

Main Street from Mill to downtown, Starkweather, Mill

Main street, Penniman, Ann arbor trail and the downtown area.

Main towards Old village

Main, Ann Arbor Trail

Main, Lilly, starkweather

main, starkweather, ann arbor trail, penniman, farmer

Main, Starkweather, Harvey

Main, Wing, Union, AA Trail, Penniman

Mill St., Starkweather, Main St (North of the railroad tracks), and continuing out to Hines Dr.

More on Main to Plymouth rd and Starkweather

Most people cycle on Hines. Bicycle lanes getting there and to downtown and old town destinations

N/A

N/a

n/a

N/A

N/A

Na

No comment

No more .. very few people use them and is causing issues with traffic

No more. There's already too many bikes lanes and virtually no one uses the ones that are there! It makes driving down town a nightmare

No paths on streets. Too dangerous. Dedicated bike paths

No reply

Non that interfere with parking

None

None

None

none

None

None

None

None

None

none

none

None

None

None

None

None

None

None

None

None

NONE bicyclists NEVER obey rules of the road

None I have never seen ANY person biking down the ones on Main St. just added congestion to the street traffic on Main & Ann Arbor Trail. Need to INSTALL a left turn arrow on the traffic light@ that intersection. Impossible to turn when concerts or activities are ongoing, maybe one car is able to turn on green after waiting for people to cross.

None that I can think of. The bike lanes on Main are under used and because lanes have eliminated traffic has increased considerably on S Harvey.

NONE!! CANCEL ALL!! TOO MANY ALOOF INCONSIDERATE BIKERS HERE. I WILL HELP BLACKOUT PAINT EXISTING LANE MARKINGS.

None, a too many "road diets" already

None, the bike lanes are a hazard. Most people on bikes do not obey traffic laws and are dangerous to pedestrians. The police should be enforcing traffic laws for those on bikes.

None, the ones on Main Street are rarely used. The addition of the lanes has not been positive on the traffic flow

None, the ones on Main Street are rarely used! Stop trying to keep up with Ann Arbor

None.

None. Never seen a bike yet on Main Street

None. Remove the ones you already have, that no one uses, on Main street

None. Stop trying to be like Ann Arbor. They are killing their businesses and traffic is a complete nightmare.

North Main Street, Starkweather

North main, Harvey, forest, starkweather, mill. Also build protected bike lanes on South main. The current configuration feels dangerous

Not bike lanes but protected bike facilities or off-road facilities. All arterials and collectors in Downtown Plymouth. Not needed on residential streets.

not sure

Not sure, the bike lanes on main street are terrible and I never see anyone use them.

Nowhere

On streets that have the appropriate dimensions to accommodate them.

Penniman

Penniman and Ann Arbor Trail

Penniman and Ann Arbor Trail.

Penniman, Ann Arbor Trail

Penniman, Ann Arbor Trail, Farmer

Please no more bike lanes!

Plymouth Rd., Lilley-Mill, Starkweather, Ann Arbor Trail, Sheldon Road.

Plymouth Road North of town

possibly Mill and extended on Main St.

Protected lanes for Main Street and Ann Arbor trail.

routes (not streets): route from Main Street to Hines Park, to Kroger, to Old Village, etc.

Sheldon

Should be on all prime use roadways. Not needed internal to subdivisions.

Starkweather, Mill, Farmer, Plymouth, Ann Arbor Trail, Ann Arbor Road, Main, Center, Penniman - EVERY STREET

Streets and at least a lane in a half for safety space

Streets that lead to/from Hines Drive (Starkweather & Farmer, Riverside).
AA Trail.
Evergreen.

The bike lanes on Main Street are never used! I've never seen anyone in one

The busy streets. AA Trail, penniman, farmer, mill, main.

The problem is the cars do not respect them

There are enough bike lanes. Many are dangerous because bikers do not obey traffic laws

There are more bikes on the sidewalk on main Street than use the bike lane.

Throughout the downtown area

To access Hines dr, either Starkweather from Main to Hines, or Mill between Main and Wilcox. Also Main St from Kellogg to Lilley would be good.

trails not streets, streets are to dangerous and in need of repair

Undecided

unsure

We don't use the bike lanes that the city installed on Main St. Waste of taxpayer money.

We need to incorporate Hines Drive into our rec plan. A resource too long overlooked.

Wilcox road connecting to Old Village and Hines Drive. Riverside connecting to Hines Drive.

You'd have to be crazy to ride a bike on Main Street with the bike lanes or not. The road is a mess with potholes and cracks. FIX THAT.

PHOTOGRAPH BY JEFFREY M. HARRIS

Question 21.

Do you have any additional input for the Recreation Master Plan?

A community outdoor pool would be amazing!!!! Northville has one, canton, we need one too. It's the only thing missing in our town

Add gymnasium and gym access to City residences....and be careful of "adding" parking, at the expense of green-spaces or good walkability. I think most people accept they have to walk more, to park in downtowns...lets not make this a city of parking spots.

All in all I believe the city does an exceptional job for it's residents

Any recreational activity (fall fest, art festival, music in park) is just a massive mosh pit. It's like spring break in ft. lauderdale.

Better access to Hines Park from the city.
Walking and biking trails.

Beyond currently identified parcels for acquisition and change back to passive natural/native landscapes, there should be a more concerted effort to restore the Tonquish Creek trail head/and trail to a naturalized area. The area is currently overrun with invasive, full of garbage/broken concrete, thick with sediment, the sides of the river are falling in carrying with it old street lamps. Old Village suffers from very few parks - or very poor access to Hines Park due to Mill/Wilcox/Northville Roads are very dangerous to cross, especially with children.

Bike paths on city streets are for a small minority at the inconvenience of many. Bicyclists generally do not adhere to traffic laws and bikes should be licensed.

Build a swimming pool at the lumber mart site. Residents only, no parking lot

Build mor electric car charging stations.

City sponsored 5Ks / races that involve residential streets being closed need to be strictly limited to non-profits or for profits who can demonstrate 100% of funds are given to charity.

Recommend the next survey state what the the City boundaries are.

Recommend the next survey include links to the ordinances so people can read about them before responding to the survey.

Hines park is in the city???

Clean up the foliage surrounding the ball field south of the Cultural Center.

Concentrate on walkability and green space. Playgrounds are nice, but there also needs to be space for people to walk and ride bikes.

Connecting Hines Drive with bike routes on Wilcox and Riverside roads would be a excellent plan.

Connecting trails and bike facilities is a key element. All bike lanes should be barrier separated or off-road.

Continue doing all we can to beautify Kellogg Park—our crown jewel. More trees are needed.

Continue to work with the township

Create additional parking spaces around town to coincide with the overload of events during summer and also for the development in and around the downtown area.

Suggestion: Move Tae Kwan Do occupants to another location (maybe by Bode's) and knock the building down to create more parking spaces close to the park.

Enforce parking times more frequently to keep people from staying too long and not go to local businesses.

Think about parking limits in public lots (i.e. like by EG Nicks, Library...etc) to keep people from leaving cars all day and sometimes all night

Creating additional parking and saving the Penn Theater should be the city's top priorities.

D 1) Provide a detailed list of what you plan to spend the millage on as I am concerned this does not exist. 2) somewhere on the city web page state that this millage will be on the ballot and provide the list from above. 3) Consider Drop the current millage request and create a new one for a nice recreation complex similar to what Livonia has and which all ages can enjoy.

Do a better job of getting input. Also, the communication of this 'PLAN' is very poor. IF this mileage goes down it'll be because it was poorly promoted. People want great parks and recreation but, the way this millage was approached was not good.

Dog park

explain the full master plan.

Fitness trails

Focus on our small town and not what Ann Arbor is doing!!

For neighborhood parks with soccer fields, consider installing turf. It is impossible to establish and maintain good grass, it's weeds and bare most of the time.

Install new play structures in all parks that are modern, interesting and have a lot of play value as opposed to the large plastic ones that look big but really do not have a lot of play value for kids.

For the love of God, stop with the bike lanes.

Get something like Canton's Summit

Great considerations and love the amenities, but I think there can be a better strategy to secure alternate public/private funding rather than fund by tax increases!

Green spaces are important

Have it done by a professional. Not the hacks at Wade Trim

Have not seen

I can not stress enough how the city needs to prevent developers from bulldozing but of homes. Make a bulldoze permit so expensive that developers won't do it. The city needs to preserve these homes or we will be left with nothing but overdeveloped streets that have no charm or character. It is a shame to see

I do not believe it is going to give you a clear picture of what people really want/need. I know that is hard to determine, but this won't do it,

I grew up in Dearborn where there are city pools available in the summer as well as a civic center with an indoor pool. I would love to have aquatic programs for my daughter available through the city. Many of the swim clubs in the area charge \$1,500 per summer and they all have waitlists, so I think many citizens would be thrilled to have the option to purchase a membership for aquatic programs through the city.

I love the availability of the neighborhood parks.

I oppose any attempt to raise taxes to fund the recreational programs.

I think green space is important, but unfortunately our taxes are so high already. It would be nice if the city could use some of its tax revenue to support this effort. The tax base of the city is massive and I can not fathom where all this money goes.

I think that Kellogg Park is much more important to the city than the small parks dispersed in the neighborhoods. In terms of funding, Kellogg should be the priority.

I think we need to take a much harder look at sizes of new houses & garages to better fit our neighborhoods. I dread the day when a large house/garage reduces sunlight to MY yard.

I would love to know more about it

I would love to see the rose compass painted!!! It's there keep it up.

I've been going to Royal Oak and West Bloomfield for years because of their recreational facilities and classes. Way more attuned to senior activities than Plymouth.

If, as stated, the Rec Department is looking to add space for youth sports, I would like to be sure that this project would include only youth sports, not sneaking in adult sport activities or redefining youth sports.

Improve the city parks in materials (maintain playscapes, landscaping). The city should be held accountable and held to the same standards to maintain its current parks, as they put on its residents. Let's place focus (and all of our increased tax dollars there!)

Include more native plantings in our parks. Spaces that are not open areas for organized recreation should be planted with native species. We have the opportunity to get on the Homegrown National Park map in a big way!

It is best to socialize ideas prior to vaguely requesting a milage without specifying where the funds will go.

It would be helpful if surveys included an option to copy your completed survey to send to your email.

Like schools, recreation is an investment in the community

Love the energy Brandon has brought to the Department. Lots of unique opportunities from trivia, cornhole, citizens academy. Keep up the good work!

More green space.

More green spaces please. Seems that every corner of undeveloped property has disappeared.

Also, the residences that back up to Tonquish Creek need to fix the drainage issues that their landscaping created....the trail is no longer passable west of the senior housing.

More indoor adult events, eucra trivia games etc.

More marked bike lanes will make biking in the city safer for everyone and keep bikes off of the sidewalks.

More pickleball

More pickleball courts

More recreation department activities for all ages, especially young adults, is a must.

More trees. More thoughtfulness to green and historic charm and/or less of the same looking new builds.

My opinion is the city is doing a good job and is forward thinking

n/a

N/A

NA

Nature reserve areas with gardens - like MSU's Tollgate would be nice.

Need more quiet green spaces and trees

No

No

No

No

no

no

No

No

no

No new taxes!

No new taxes!

No one uses the bike lanes because they are in the street and they don't follow the road rules at all. They just roll thru the lights.

None

None

Nopel!

Not at this time

Not at this time.

Not sure exactly what the plan is.

Over development has greatly decreased the quality of life in this area. Not everything is simply about money and big profits

PARC has so much potential but I wish it had more city recreational activities, especially more open swim and gym times. If there were more places I could take my kids on rainy or very cold days, I would be so happy.

Parks are a huge plus factor for the city. The more we can turn vacant land into usable parks the better. Condos are nice but keep a balance between housing and park area on newly developed plots.

Pedestrian friendly downtown is very important for all of us I believe

pickle ball courts are needed in the city.

Please communicate often using emails, and public meetings (with Zoom), throughout the planning stages of any money spent from the millage if passed.

Please continue to support a recreational soccer program and work to restore the offerings up through U14.

Please don't commercialize Plymouth or drastically change it.

Please fix the fountains in all the parks. Only one that works is in Smith Park. Why are they left broken for the past couple years?

Please no Marijuana dispensaries, retail, grow facilities or storage.

Plymouth is a nice place to play and recreate. You're doing a nice job.

Plymouth's parks are well-maintained and reflect well on the community. You are doing a great job.

Public pool + better shade tolerant and high traffic grass in Kellogg park

Put it in the shredder and focus on gutting the cultural center of anything to do with hockey... then consider uses that really benefit and appeal to City residents.

Quit being a bully with downtown restaurants and the Penn Theatre.

Really think a community pool would be a great and compelling asset!

Retaining green space is critical.

Route Tonquish creek from under the city to create a pond on the Wilcox House property. I think it is private property so it is complicated, but if city were to buy the property it could remain protected and be extension of Kellogg Park with a pond for walking and even skating when conditions permit.

Scale the plan down a notch and reduce your millage ask.

Seek more input from residents rather than so strongly relying upon consultants, and the DDA

Spend more time encouraging investment by homeowners instead of stifling it. The costs of land and construction is very expensive, people do not need to be told what to do. Most builders and homeowners have great ideas and are creating homes that will last much longer than the ones they tore down. Also leave the restaurants alone with their outdoor seating. We have a short outdoor dining season, the restaurants are a huge asset to the city and a large reason why people come here. It's a very difficult business with staffing, cost of food and other expenses, support them please.

Stop rezoning properties, focus on the safety and security of the people that live here and not build, build, build. Consider an ordinance to force homeowners to take care of their trees, trimming them as needed not just letting them grow through power lines resulting in power outages that can easily be avoided. Requiring dead trees and evergreens to be removed as these are a fire hazard and perpetuate electricity outages during storms. A tree ordinance is one thing but actually taking care of them is another.

Stop trying to be Ann Arbor - focus on fields and parks not bike lanes which are not used

Take the bike lanes off Main Street

Thank you for your efforts

Thanks for your work and care for the city I love.

The City would benefit from having an outdoor pool. I know we have limited land resources, but we are a fantastic city, and we can and should think about these things. Lastly, thank you to the City and to the planning commission for being attentive to NOISE. We deal with trains, and that is something that we can work with the railroads about. But one thing we CAN control is the noise emitted by vehicles and motorcycles. I'd like to see this policed better in the City. This is such a tremendous place to walk and congregate. Motor cyclists have every right to come in and enjoy the city. They do NOT have a right to ruin the time of peaceful walkers, including those with dogs and babies, outdoor diners, and everyone else who is respectful of others. I'd like to see either signage in the DTP or some intentional policing to share that we have allowable decible levels by ordinance in the City, and that we police it.

Lastly, as for getting information in general and regarding special events, I'd add that the option of this coming via text/sms would be a welcome addition. So many of us get our information by being notified via text to our phones.

Thanks for asking for our input!

The Cultural Center should have the Council on aging activities there. There is more room there for senior activities. There could be travel activities there also for Seniors. The city does nothing for seniors when it comes to activities. It is all done through the township.

The park at Maple & Evergreen needs one or two signs indicating that it is a public park and not just for the rich. It should also be developed to have one or two soccer fields. If my neighborhood park can house a soccer field, then the rich people should have one or two in their neighborhood, especially with the size of that park. A play structure for little kids should also be put in that park. Maybe a few benches and better lighting for at night.

There should be signs at the park at Maple and Evergreen should have signs indicating that it is a public park, not a park just for the rich living around the park. This park should also have a soccer field because it is so large. My neighborhood park has a field and it is a lot smaller. Maybe a Playscape as well.

Too much emphasis is being placed on recreation to the detriment of maintaining and enhancing the parks.

We always hear 'One Plymouth' yet if a City resident wants to reserve a shelter in McClumpha we cannot do so because we do not reside at a Township address...and yet City residents pay far more in taxes and the Township residents seem to think they have a bigger voice on what tax dollars are spent creating. Just an observation...

We are very upset about the lack of clarity and enforcement of the crosswalk signs on Evergreen at Penniman and at Ann Arbor Trail. Cars do not stop at all. The signs state that cars must stop for pedestrians "in the crosswalk". No one knows what that means. Does it include the sidewalk right at the street where pedestrians are waiting to cross? Does it merely state the obvious law that you can't drive straight into someone who is in crosswalk in the street? I've watched our children and our neighbors sit at those crosswalks, push the lights, and wait and wait for drivers to do anything. I can't believe our tax dollars paid those signs and lights without any enforcement by police or a clear ordinance that cars must stop if the lights are flashing.

We need to cooperate with neighboring communities instead of increasing our infrastructure so that we don't get trapped in having property and buildings that we won't be able to maintain long term. If this is truly a joint master plan it needs to be jointly supported from a fiscal standpoint; any additional infrastructure should be purchased and maintained by the entire community - the city and the township. The model used by the Plymouth District Library is a good example. I am not in favor of any opened ended millage request that includes items that are not definitive.

We need ways to get people out of their houses and meeting each other, engaging with each other and building community. It doesn't have to be a sports thing. Think beyond the sports box and offer opportunities for engagement that can be enjoyed by many different people.

We really appreciate the dog bags in the parks! Such a nice little touch that helps keep them clean if people forget / run out.

Continue to invest in a walkable downtown. This is why we and many of our friends moved to the city of Plymouth.

Plymouth needs an outdoor public pool! It's too bad that people have to join long waitlists or join a club to swim laps or go hangout on a hot day.

A social zone downtown would be really nice.

What happened to working with Plymouth Township? Why should survey include people who don't live in the city. They will not be paying the tax. Our neighborhood parks are great.

What is the master plan? Also, the City doesn't need a joint recreation plan with Plymouth Twp.

When there is a event going on in the downtown Plymouth area, such as Music in the Park, or art fairs, etc. There is no place. I have often left because I could not park and I can't walk that far due to health reasons. I have tried to go to a particular shop or restaurant or go to the Penn, and after driving around 2 or 3 times, I often have to leave due to lack of parking or the time restrictions. 2 hours parking limit is not enough time to go out to eat and see a movie. And if there is something going on in the downtown area and you just want to support the Penn, I often can't go due to the parking situation. Thank you.

Would be awesome to have a Plymouth Rec Center like Livonia has.

Would LOVE to see plans for a public pool!

Yes, I would not be opposed to a MODERATE millage to improve the recreation facilities in Plymouth, however the proposed millage is WAY too high. I will vote no as the millage as it stands now.

Yes.. don't see how many people you can jam in this small town. It's cute.. historical.. and very pleasant to live in but definitely overcrowding will be a problem. We are not above crime..dope..drugs...etc...we are all human. Love the churches in this town.. whether you like it or not... we all need God.

RESOLUTION

The following Resolution was offered by _____ and seconded by _____.

WHEREAS The City of Plymouth participates with the State Department of Natural Resources for Recreational grants and as such, is required to have a current Parks and Recreation Master Plan, and

WHEREAS The City Commission has identified the completion of a Parks and Recreation Master Plan as a one-year task as a part of the City's overall strategic plan, and

WHEREAS The City Commission has previously authorized the services of L Groya Consulting, LLC And Epic/MRA to assist city staff with the development of the draft Parks and Recreation Master Plan and to provide input to the plan from a statistically accurate survey of the Residents of the city, and

WHEREAS There is now a need to provide the public a 30-day review period of the proposed Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City Commission of the City of Plymouth does hereby direct that a copy of the draft Parks and Recreation Master Plan be available at the City Manager's Office at City Hall and at the Plymouth Cultural Center, Recreation Department Office. Further, the draft plan shall also be available on the city's web site at www.plymouthmi.gov.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the City Commission of the City of Plymouth does hereby establish a public hearing on the draft Parks and Recreation Master Plan (2024 – 2028) on Monday, November 20, 2023, at 7:00 p.m. at the Plymouth City Hall, at 201 S. Main, Plymouth, MI. The City Clerk is directed to post the appropriate notices as required.