

To: Brighton Township Board of Trustees (manager@brightontwp.com)
Cc: Brighton Township Planning Commission (planner@brightontwp.com)
O.W.L. (info@woodlandlake.info)

Re: The Cove at Woodland Lake – RZ #25/01

Subject: Statutory Basis for Denial of PUD and Baseline R-2 Development and Request for Reversal of Planning Commission Recommendation

Dear Township Trustees,

I am a riparian property owner on Woodland Lake and respectfully request that the Brighton Township Board of Trustees **deny the proposed PUD rezoning for The Cove at Woodland Lake (RZ #25/01)** and **direct the Planning Commission to reverse its recommendation**, consistent with the Township’s statutory responsibilities and adopted Master Plan.

I reference the **January 12, 2026 memo submitted by the Organization of Woodland Lake (OWL)**, which documents substantial, data-supported concerns regarding declining water quality, excessive impervious surface coverage, stormwater runoff, and permanent environmental impacts to Woodland Lake.

Statutory Responsibilities

Under the **Michigan Zoning Enabling Act (PA 110 of 2006)**, zoning decisions must be made »in accordance with a plan designed to promote public health, safety, and welfare» (**MCL 125.3201(1), p. 9**), and zoning ordinances must be **based on an adopted plan** that gives reasonable consideration to the **conservation of natural resources and property values (MCL 125.3203(1), p. 10)**.

The **Michigan Planning Enabling Act (PA 33 of 2008)** requires that master plans guide development in a manner that promotes public welfare and ensures the **use of natural resources in accordance with their character and adaptability (MCL 125.3807(2)(d)(viii), p. 3)**, and that master plans address **waterways, drainage, flood prevention, and pollution prevention (MCL 125.3833(2), pp. 7–8)**.

Under the **Charter Township Act (PA 359 of 1947)**, **all legislative authority** is vested in the Township Board (**MCL 42.5, p. 4**), and the Act is to be **liberally construed in the interest of public health, safety, and welfare (MCL 42.33, p. 20)**. The Township is further charged with **stewardship and preservation of township property and assets (MCL 42.10, pp. 7–8)**.

Master Plan Non-Compliance

As documented in the OWL submission, **neither the proposed PUD nor development under the underlying R-2 Baseline zoning complies with the Brighton Township Master Plan** for this site.

The Master Plan explicitly states:

- **Private road standards should limit road length** to reduce impervious surface coverage (p. 59);
- Development should **minimize total impervious area and conserve natural features** (p. 59);
- **Vegetated buffers, riparian corridors, and limits on impervious surfaces** are essential to mitigating impacts (p. 60); and
- **Protecting the integrity of inland lakes is vital to maintaining quality of life** (p. 60).

Both development scenarios substantially exceed these standards.

Regional Planning Commission Rejection

The **Livingston County Planning Commission formally rejected this proposal by a 5-1 vote**, citing environmental and land-use concerns. This independent, regional determination reinforces that the proposed PUD and contemplated R-2 development fail to meet accepted planning standards.

Authority to Limit Buildable Lots

The Township has both the **authority and responsibility** to require development be limited to the number of buildable lots supportable under zoning standards, the Master Plan, and protection of residents and natural resources. Developers are entitled to reasonable use, but not to development intensity that conflicts with adopted policy or causes permanent environmental harm.

Objective limitations include:

- **Land Division Act constraints**, which limit parcel creation based on parent parcel status and statutory criteria; and
- **Master Plan road-length limitations** designed to reduce impervious surface coverage and stormwater impacts (p. 59).

Process and Oversight Concerns

I respectfully note concern regarding the administrative recommendation to approve the PUD despite clear Master Plan conflicts, subsequent Planning Commission rejection, and a **5-1 rejection by the Livingston County Planning Commission**. Given the long-term environmental consequences, this warrants careful, independent review by the Township Trustees as the final legislative authority.

Request

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Brighton Township Board of Trustees:

1. **Deny the proposed PUD rezoning.**
2. **Acknowledge that development under the existing R-2 zoning, as contemplated, also fails to comply with the Master Plan;** and
3. **Direct the Planning Commission to reconsider and reverse its recommendation,** encouraging a development approach consistent with the Master Plan and protective of Woodland Lake.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Cheryl Wasilewski

Name: Cheryl Wasilewski

Riparian Property Owner, Woodland Lake

Address: 2621 S. Hacker Road

Date: 1/16/2026

STATUTORY FOOTNOTE APPENDIX

Michigan Zoning Enabling Act (PA 110 of 2006)

- MCL 125.3201(1) – Public health, safety, welfare requirement (p. 9)
- MCL 125.3203(1) – Zoning must be based on a plan; conservation of natural resources and property values (p. 10)

Michigan Planning Enabling Act (PA 33 of 2008)

- MCL 125.3807(2)(d)(viii) – Use of natural resources consistent with character and adaptability (p. 3)
- MCL 125.3833(2) – Waterways, drainage, flood prevention, pollution prevention (pp. 7–8)

Charter Township Act (PA 359 of 1947)

- MCL 42.5 – Legislative authority vested in Township Board (p. 4)
- MCL 42.10 – Stewardship and preservation of township property/assets (pp. 7–8)
- MCL 42.33 – Liberal construction in the interest of public health, safety, and welfare (p. 20)