

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MERIDIAN
PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
January 9, 2012**

APPROVED

**5151 Marsh Road, Okemos, MI 48864-1198
853-4000, Town Hall Room, 7:00 P.M.**

PRESENT: Commissioners Cordill, Deits, Goodale, Hildebrandt, Honicky, Jackson, **Norkin**, Scales, Scott-Craig

ABSENT:

STAFF: Principal Planner Gail Oranchak, Director of Public Works and Engineering Ray Severy

1. Call meeting to order

Chair Deits called the regular meeting to order at 7:04 P.M.

2. Approval of agenda

Commissioner Jackson moved to approve the agenda. Seconded by Commissioner Scales.

VOICE VOTE: Motion carried 8-0.

3. Approval of Minutes

Commissioner Scott-Craig moved to approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of December 19, 2011. Seconded by Commissioner Cordill.

Planning Commission discussion:

- Preference for more articulation in the minutes relative to Special Use Permit #09081 (Grand Petro Mart)
- Video streaming of the hearing is available on demand through the Township's website
- Tabling of minutes until a decision is made on amendments

Commissioner Scales moved to table the Regular Meeting Minutes of December 19, 2011. Seconded by Commissioner Honicky.

VOICE VOTE: Motion carried unanimously

4. Election of the Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretary for 2012

Commissioner Norkin nominated Tom Deits as 2012 Chair of the Planning Commission. Seconded by Commissioner Hildebrandt.

Commissioner Scales nominated Pat Jackson as 2012 Chair of the Planning Commission. Seconded by Commissioner Cordill.

Planning Commission discussion:

- Outstanding job of all three officers in 2011

VOICE VOTE FOR COMMISSIONER JACKSON: Motion failed 4-5.

VOICE VOTE FOR COMMISSIONER DEITS: Motion carried 6-3.

Commissioner Scales nominated Pat Jackson as 2012 Vice-Chair of the Planning Commission. Seconded by Commissioner Scott-Craig.

Commissioner Honicky moved to close nominations for 2012 Vice-Chair of the Planning

Commission. Seconded by Commissioner Scales.

VOICE VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Scales nominated Holly Cordill as 2012 Secretary of the Planning Commission. Seconded by Commissioner Norkin.

Planning Commission discussion:

- Scope of duties for the Secretary

Commissioner Scales moved to close nominations for 2012 Secretary of the Planning Commission. Seconded by Commissioner Honicky.

VOICE VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.

5. Public Remarks

Chair Deits opened and closed the floor for public remarks.

6. Communications

- A. Complete Streets Workshop – Thursday, January 12, 2012 at 6:30 P.M. in the Town Hall Room of the Meridian Municipal Building

Planning Commission discussion:

- State law requirement to look at Township ordinances “in light” of the complete streets process
- Complete streets is an integrated view of transportation in the Township, including automobiles, mass transit, bicycles, pedestrians, etc. and how best to facilitate the planning process
- Township received a grant from the Ingham County Health Department to hold this workshop in order to receive input from the public to use in the creation of a policy for complete streets
- Online survey can be accessed through the Township website’s homepage at www.meridian.mi.us
- Input has been received from the Ingham County Road Commission, Ingham County Health Department and various other community groups

7. Public hearings

- A. *Commission Review #12013 (Meridian Township), request for Section 61 review to extend water and sewer service to the Greenwood subdivision located on the east side of Green Road, north of Shoesmith Road.

Chair opened the public hearing at 7:17 P.M.

- Introduction by the Chair (announcement of procedures, time limits and protocols for public participation and applicants)
- Summary of subject matter
Principal Planner Oranchak summarized the commission review as outlined in staff memorandum dated January 5, 2012.
- Applicant
Director of Public Works and Engineering Ray Severy stated this project was initiated because a resident on Oakdale has a failed septic tank and inquired if he could connect to public sewer. He added the only way this resident can repair his septic field is to install an

expensive engineered system. Mr. Severy noted a unique aspect of existing subdivisions which do not have water and sewer is that the only way for the homes to be serviced by these two utilities is to have the Township build the connections and then have residents connect when their existing systems fail. He spoke to the high improbability of a successful petition for water and sewer installation due to the number of recent upgrades to wells and septic systems as well as those residents who have proper operating systems. Mr. Severy spoke to the need for a change in the language of the Township's current ordinance which requires sewer hookup within one year of installation. He added that in his tenure with the Township, this requirement has not been enforced for any project unless a resident's system failed.

Director Severy indicated in the last few years, the County has adopted a point of sale policy, which requires water and sewer inspection by the County prior to sale of a home. He explained that if the inspection reveals either the septic system or the well does not meet the county's code, it must be upgraded and, further, if public water is available, they must connect at that time. Director Severy stated the Township would build this project with monies from the Sewer Fund, and residents would pay their portion as they connected to the system. He added that once the project is completed, the Township Board would adopt a payback district, which establishes the amount each home would be required to pay to hook into the system. Director Severy indicated Phase I of this project would be to construct a sewer line from the existing sewer along Eagle's Way across Maple Hill Drive, up Redondo Drive and over on Oakdale to service 6065 Green Road. He noted it is not the Township's intent at this time to construct sewer on Beechwood Drive, the remaining section of Maple Hill Drive, or along Green Road. Director Severy indicated the Township has no current plans to extend water to the subject area at this time.

- Public

Neil Bowlby, 6020 Beechwood, Haslett, spoke in favor of the project, while expressing concern with the provision in the ordinance which requires hookup within one year. He requested the Planning Commission incorporate language in the resolution which deletes the one-year hookup requirement.

Richard Sulin, 6023 Beechwood Drive, Haslett, also requested language be included in the resolution which deletes the one-year hookup requirement. He asked what constitutes well and/or septic system failure and inquired if a plugged well point which was subsequently cleaned would be considered a failure or repair.

Mr. Severy referred Mr. Sulin to the Health Department for an answer regarding the failure of a septic system. He responded that a plugged well point would constitute a repair. Mr. Severy added that in many cases, the well must be made deeper to make it work or drill a new well. He stated the Township would not allow a new well to be drilled.

Commissioner Deits inquired if a resident experienced a failed well, would they also be required to hook up to the sewer system.

Director Severy responded that the two systems are independent of one another and if the septic system was still operational, there would be no hookup requirement for septic.

Carrie Hiser, 6020 Beechwood Drive, Haslett, did not oppose the project, but expressed concern there be language incorporated into the ordinance which does not "force" hookup within one year. She added she had concern that once the water and sewer systems were constructed, the Township would not have the funds to pay for the construction, and then use its "legal right" to force hookup as a means to pay for construction of those systems.

Chris Stephon, 6065 Green Road, Haslett, identified himself as the resident with failed septic. He added he is within the urban services boundary, and in support of water and sewer service to the Greenwood subdivision. Mr. Stephon spoke to the health and safety concern for homes on small lots (.26 acre) where there would not be sufficient room for a new septic system in the event of a septic failure. Mr. Stephon believed the engineered systems he researched have landscape challenges.

Dennis Welch, 627 Maple Hill Drive, Haslett, expressed concern with the one-year hookup requirement as he had his septic system replaced last year. He asked as to the cost of hookup.

Mr. Severy responded the cost for sewer hookup is made up of two charges: the benefit charge (the cost of installing the sewer) and a connection fee slightly over \$2,000. He indicated water hookup also has a benefit charge (the cost of installing the water line), a connection fee of slightly under \$2,000, a water meter (approximately \$300, plus the remote read system used) and the property owner is responsible for running a six-inch plastic water line from their property line to their home. Mr. Severy stated costs are not yet available for the sewer installation, but indicated an approximate cost of \$10-\$12,000 for sewer and less for water.

Mr. Welch asked if the drain field is at the back of the house, would the Township go around the back corner of the house and out to the street, or through the basement and out the front side.

Mr. Severy responded it can be constructed either way. He noted since it is the property owner's responsibility, the Township looks at the current placement of the existing septic field in order to leave the lead at the street in an appropriate location for ease of hookup.

Dan Pruder, speaking on behalf of fiancé, Heather Stephon, owner of 6003 Green Road, stated sewer is already on Green Road and thought it was easier to continue the sewer down Green Road for the requesting property owner to hook up to that sewer line.

Director Severy responded the existing sewer on Green Road is not deep enough to service the entire subdivision with gravity and the Township does not want to install a lift or pump station. He added an easement is still needed from the property owner at 6003 Green Road, and talks continue with that owner.

Mr. Pruder believed the proposed plan presented this evening was premature, given the fact the plans shows water and sewer through property for which an easement has not yet been obtained.

Director Severy responded there is a sewer manhole near Buttonwood and Green Road which could be used to service Green Road, but not the remainder of the subdivision. He pointed to the fact that the first 450-500 feet of sewer would not service any property and "drives" up the cost for the residents who would connect. He believed it more advantageous to the Greenwood subdivision to construct the water and sewer extensions as proposed.

Mr. Pruder spoke to the cost of connection, stating that Ms. Stephon spent approximately \$20,000 to hookup.

Director Severy indicated 6003 Green Road has a temporary connection to the existing sewer system. He noted the charge by the Township for temporary connection is \$3,000 with a signed agreement that if a petition for sewer is successful, the home owner must pay whatever assessment is determined. Director Severy believed the only additional cost

incurred by the property owner would be to connect the home to the manhole. He added that while the Township has not taken bids on this project, a \$200,000-\$250,000 cost estimate has been calculated to install Phase I.

Charlotte Sulin, 6023 Beechwood Drive, Haslett, inquired if a property owner decides to sell a property, is the seller or buyer required to hookup to the sewer in order for the sale to take place.

Director Severy responded that the closing of the sale cannot take place until there is a connection.

Ms. Sulin asked for an estimated monthly charge once hookup is in place.

Director Severy responded it depended on whether there is also a hookup to water, as the sewer bill is based on the amount of water used. He noted there is a sewer only charge that is approximately \$40 per quarter and water is slightly less per quarter.

- Planning Commission discussion:

Chair Deits inquired as to the focus of the Section 61 Review.

Principal Planner Oranchak responded a Section 61 Review deals with ensuring the extension of utilities is consistent with the existing Master Plan. She added the Master Plan designates the Greenwood Subdivision for residential development with a density of 1.25-3.5 units/acre.

Chair Deits spoke to the constrained spectrum decision making power at this point in the process.

Commissioner Cordill asked for a definition of a metes and bounds property.

Principal Planner Oranchak responded it is a legal description defined by the dimensions of a site.

Commissioner Norkin believed making utilities available to the subdivision is in keeping with the goal in the Township's Master Plan regarding development within the urban service boundary.

Commissioner Norkin suggested giving ample consideration to the resident's comments this evening and postpone a decision on this issue, if needed, until all the facts are presented.

Commissioner Norkin inquired as to where funding for the project is coming from.

Director Severy responded funds would come from the Sewer Fund fund balance, which has adequate funds for this project.

Commissioner Norkin inquired as to the total project estimate.

Director Severy responded that one has not yet been calculated.

Commissioner Norkin asked for a cost estimate for Phase I.

Director Severy reiterated an estimated cost of \$200,000-\$250,000.

Commissioner Norkin inquired as to the length of time for payback.

Director Severy responded the cost of hookup can be spread over a ten year period with interest.

Commissioner Norkin inquired if the Township had legal right-of-way for crossing the property of 6003 Green Road.

Director Severy responded not at the current time.

Commissioner Scott-Craig believed the public needed assurance that they would not be required to hookup within one year and inquired if there is a mechanism to accomplish this.

Principal Planner Oranchak responded the Township Board would need to initiate a change to the ordinance and noted that an amendment to address this issue would not be part of the zoning ordinance.

Commissioner Scales inquired if the Planning Commission could pass the proposed resolution dependent upon the Township Board addressing an ordinance change.

Chair Deits did not believe such an action was legal, as state statute clearly delineates what the Planning Commission can consider during a Section 61 Review. He believed the Planning Commission could entertain a motion to request the Board review this issue with due dispatch.

Commissioner Jackson requested clarification on Ingham County Health Department's point of sale requirement and inquired if that requirement overrode any Township requirement.

Director Severy responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Hildebrandt expressed concern with the wetlands in the subdivision and asked how the sewer project would impact the wetland

Principal Planner Oranchak responded that the wetland map shows the majority of the wetland is on the property to the south of Greenwood subdivision.

Commissioner Hildebrandt believed the back yards of many of the homes in this subdivision "dipped" into the wetland and inquired if the wetland is there, how the sewer itself impacts the wetlands.

Principal Planner Oranchak clarified the proposed sewer line would be constructed in the road rights-of-way and none of the roads appear to be impacted by wetlands at this point.

Director Severy added the sewer would have no impact on the wetlands, unless there was a break in the line. He added that sanitary sewers are built with primarily plastic pipe with sealed joints which run all the way to the house.

Commissioner Scott-Craig noted that the Ingham County Health Department gave a presentation to the Township Board at its December 6, 2011 meeting, noting that at the time of sale, the Health Department makes a determination whether the existing systems are up to grade and, if they are, the sale goes forward. He added that the only time the Health Department requires hook up is if the water or septic system is inadequate.

Chair Deits added that his recollection during that meeting was that only a dozen or so of those situations existed county wide within the history of the program and none were in Meridian Township.

Commissioner Norkin inquired as to the impact on a property's value in Greenwood subdivision for those lots who have the ability to connect to sewer and/or water. He requested clarification as to whether it would increase the property's value or make it more difficult to sell because of the contingency that connection must be made prior to closing the sale.

Director Severy stated that, in his opinion, it would help the property owner.

Commissioner Norkin asked if, in the Director's experience, the properties which become "hookable" sell at a higher price.

Director Severy responded that he has no experience in the assessing area, and could not comment on the question. He added that regardless of whether the property owner at 6065 Green Road puts in an engineered system or hooks up to public sewer, there is cost involved.

Commissioner Honicky inquired as to the impact of a sewer system on the wetland

Director Severy responded water will eventually get to the wetland. He indicated if the septic systems for homes which back up to the wetland are working properly, water which enters the wetland will be clean. Director Severy noted that once a septic system fails, polluted water enters the wetland until it is discovered and corrected.

Commissioner Honicky asked what depth of well casing is necessary to avoid drinking water contamination.

Director Severy responded the Public Health Department would have that information, although the well depth for this subdivision would vary. He noted public wells constructed by the Township are approximately 400 feet deep, but believed the wells in this neighborhood would not be at that depth. Director Severy indicated it is dependent upon the depth to reach the good aquifer, but was unsure as to the amount of buffer needed to protect the well from septic field contaminants. He added there is a horizontal separation required between the well and the septic field for that purpose, but was unsure as to the length of that measurement.

Commissioner Jackson inquired if the Planning Commission could, as previously mentioned, condition the Section 61 approval upon removal of language in the ordinance which requires hookup within one year.

Principal Planner Oranchak responded the Planning Commission cannot accomplish removal of language in the ordinance with the provided resolution for the purpose of tonight's Section 61 Review. She added a separate motion which recommends the Board make such a change would be appropriate.

Commissioner Deits stated the Planning Commission is approving the existence of the proposed project and its consistency to the Master Plan. He inquired if the advisability of the entire project rested with the Director of Public Works and Engineering.

Director Severy responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Hildebrandt believed action tonight on this issue would be premature and place the “cart” before the “horse.”

Chair closed the public hearing at 8:07 P.M.

- B. Zoning Amendment #12010 (Planning Commission), request to amend section 86-687(11) of the Code of Ordinances to permit a changing message sign to display the price and grade of gasoline on a gas station’s free standing sign.

Chair opened the public hearing at 8:07 P.M.

- Summary of subject matter
Principal Planner Oranchak summarized the proposed zoning amendment as outlined in staff memorandum dated January 5, 2012
- Planning Commission discussion:
Commissioner Jackson suggested using a more generic term such as fuel instead of gasoline.

Commissioner Scott-Craig expressed concern that an excessive number of options on the sign could lead to prices changes every minute or two and essentially become a flashing sign.

Principal Planner Oranchak responded that a text amendment could be added to address this concern. She added it is up to the applicant how the 12 square feet on the sign is used. Principal Planner Oranchak noted when changing and traveling message sign applications came before the Planning Commission for other than gas stations, the Planning Commission limited the number of times the sign could be changed in a day.

Commissioner Norkin indicated he could only support the zoning amendment if it does not become a moving sign. He believed light intensity was a safety concern, as glare is a distraction for drivers. Commissioner Norkin also expressed concerned with “scope creep” and did not want this zoning amendment to allow the sign to become a “moving” sign.

Commissioner Norkin stated that making this change before the Planning Commission has the larger discussion of the sign ordinance would be a disadvantage. He referred to the increasing number of fuel types available at service stations and preferred that each station continue to come before the Planning Commission until that broader discussion on signage takes place.

Commissioner Cordill believed the Planning Commission needs to strive for consistency so that all gas stations owners are treated the same. She believed the zoning amendment change to be reasonable, although additional criteria could be added.

Chair Deits asked as to the cost for a special use permit application.

Principal Planner Oranchak responded the special use permit application fee is \$500. She noted if it is an amendment to an existing special use permit, the application fee is \$250.

Chair Deits indicated this zoning amendment would save applicants a fair amount of associated expense.

Commissioner Scales reminded Planning Commissioners that they previously approved a changing message sign for fuel purposes for the gas station at Marsh and Haslett Roads. He believed that before the request is denied, the perceived problems need to be explored and discussed. Commissioner Scales noted that if the issue is a driving problem, changing

message signs are on interstate highways where motorists travel 70 miles per hour. He spoke in support of granting a changing message sign for as many times as the owner chooses to change the message.

Commissioner Hildebrandt believed there is a dramatic difference between the access and egress on Grand River Avenue and I-96. She was in support of making a reasoned decision, one which does not allow for flashing and distracting signs.

Chair Deits reminded Commissioners that they are providing guidance to staff at this public hearing, adding that draft language will come back to the Commission at a later date.

Commissioner Scott-Craig noted examples of this type of changing message sign that has concerned residents are the signs at East Lansing and Okemos Public High Schools. He believed the schools have stopped changing the signs because it was a distraction for young drivers. He urged caution in unnecessarily limiting the gas station's ability to change prices.

Chair Deits reminded the public that the Planning Commission has no control over the flashing LED signs on school property as it is at the discretion of the respective school districts.

Commissioner Scales noted that watching an individual manually change the price of fuel from a ladder is also a distraction, so the distraction argument exists either way.

Chair Deits stated when consideration is given to 15 minute intervals, no driver at an intersection would be stationary for more than one price change.

Commissioner Scales urged caution in making rules which will not be enforced.

Chair Deits inquired if language of the proposed zoning amendment could limit the display to price and grade of fuel only. He spoke to signage for a gas station just outside of the Township's boundary which also displays how much cheaper their prices are than the gas station across the street.

Principal Planner Oranchak responded that Section 86-687(5)a does limit the sign display to only price and grade of gasoline.

Commissioner Norkin affirmed his desire for consistent treatment among the Township's business owners across the entire Grand River corridor, not just gas stations. He believed the concept should be placed in the Master Plan for both aesthetics and safety reasons. Commissioner Norkin referenced advertising data from sign manufacturers indicating that LED signs which flash with intensity automatically "pull" the eyes from a distance of .75 mile and offered to provide that information to interested Commissioners.

Chair closed the public hearing at 8:27 P.M.

8. Unfinished Business

- A. *Commission Review #12013 (Meridian Township), request for Section 61 review to extend water and sewer service to the Greenwood subdivision located on the east side of Green Road, north of Shoemith Road.

Commissioner Scales moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the Township Board amend the requirement for property owners to hook up to water and sanitary service within one year. Seconded by Commissioner Goodale.

Commissioner Jackson offered the following friendly amendment:

- **Add “rescind and/or” prior to the word “amend”**

The friendly amendment was accepted by the maker.

Planning Commission discussion:

- Need for a way to articulate the motion relative to a specific time-frame, i.e., ten (10) years
- Likelihood of a well or septic system failure
- Previous staff comment that the life of a septic tank is 10-15 years
- Concern that a specific time frame would not allow for the ability to repair a septic system
- Continued concern that water coming from the leach bed system is drinkable
- Over time, water from the leach bed will reach the wetland and influence it
- Whole subdivision should hookup to sewer within a specific time frame
- Any such ordinance change would come from and before the Board, not the Planning Commission
- Discussion on a specific time frame for mandatory hookup is premature

Commissioner Scott-Craig offered the following amendment:

- **Remove the “rescind and/or”**

Seconded by Commissioner Norkin.

VOICE VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.

Continued Planning Commission discussion:

- \$200,000-\$250,000 of taxpayer money will be expended for Phase I of this project
- Mechanism needed for township taxpayers to be made whole in the future
- Staff suggestion to include the Section number to be amended

Without objection, the maker of the motion accepted staff’s suggestion to insert “Section 78-152 (c) (1)” after the words “amend the”.

VOICE VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Scales moved [and read into the record] NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MERIDIAN approves the location, character and extent of the proposed water and sanitary sewer extensions to the Greenwood Subdivision and adjacent properties within 200 feet of the proposed sewer line.

Seconded by Commissioner Honicky.

Planning Commission and staff discussion:

- Additional questions which require further information be provided to Commission members
- Right-of-way easement has not yet been obtained
- A vote on this issue tonight would be preliminary and inappropriate
- Majority of opinions from the community were in favor of this project
- No individual notice is required to be sent to surrounding property owners for a Section 61 Review
- Water and sewer service to the Greenwood subdivision is a public works project

- Reminder of what a Section 61 Review entails for the Planning Commission
- Planning Commission decision is reported to the Township Board
- Township Board has the final decision on this commission review
- Township Board has the final decision on the expenditure for this public works project
- Process for approving this public works project would be through a budget amendment
- Process for public works projects does not have notification requirements specified by law
- Small section of the Michigan Planning Enabling Act which indicates the role of the Planning Commission is to review the utility installation to evaluate its consistency with Master Plan
- Planning Commission need to focus on the confines of its decision making authority regarding this public works project

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Commissioners Cordill, Goodale, Honicky, Scales, Scott-Craig,
 Vice Chair Jackson, Chair Deits
 NAYS: Commissioners Hildebrandt, Norkin
 Motion carried 7-2.

9. Other Business

A. Recap of January 3, 2012 Visioning Session

Planning Commission discussion:

- Appreciation for the concept of all appointees and elected officials in one room to share visions and objectives
- Meridian Township one of only a few townships which holds visioning sessions
- Suggestion to have more frequent visioning sessions than on a yearly basis
- Focus of specific township missions and objectives
- Preference for more Planning Commission interaction with the Parks Commission
- Preference to invite the Environmental Task Force and the Zoning Board of Appeals to have more interaction with the Planning Commission
- Discussion needed on the rescission of Planning Commission authority to approve Capital Improvement projects
- Valuable information was shared at the visioning session
- High level of volunteerism among residents who serve on the various boards and commissions
- Planning Commission Chair discussed:
 - how to focus on infrastructure and infill development within the Master Plan
 - how to encourage redevelopment
 - how best to offer incentives for developers to change from upzoning land to rehabilitating properties through infill development
- Need for ease in making good development possible within Township boundaries
- Ordinances which require variances is not good policy
- Request for future Planning Commission discussion regarding appropriateness of its interaction with various boards and commissions
 - Possible topic of discussion at the training session with the Township Attorney
- March 5th and 19th as possible dates for the Planning Commission training session with the Township attorney

B. Urban Service Management Area (USMA) Expansion Policy

Planning Commission and staff discussion:

- Board has chosen to change the proposed USMA to include other properties

- Board has requested the Planning Commission develop policy for making changes to the USB future
- Useful to set policy for making changes prior to actual changes made to the boundary
- Policy difference for properties inside and outside of the USMA
- Process for Planning Commission creation of policy
- Need for a brainstorming work session to identify direction for policy development
- Suggestion to create a list of issues to be discussed
- Request for Planning Commissioners to receive an electronic copy of the criteria from the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission
- Staff to provide previous Board decisions and/or court settlements which would influence the crafting of policy (e.g., sewer line for St. Martha's Parish)
- Board desire to have the Planning Commission move forward with other sections of the Master Plan
- Philosophical difference between the Planning Commission view of the boundary location and some members of the Township
- Preference by some Township Board members to have a buffer built into the USMA
- Properties within the USMA as an added value to the property owner
- Objective of regionalism relative to the urban service boundary was lost by the Township Board
- Tri-county regions within the state are attempting to define urban service boundaries for the objective of mitigating sprawl
- Drawing a regional urban service boundary so that the region can compete for major developments and employers is the bigger picture
- Light agenda for the next Planning Commission meeting would provide time for a work session on the urban service management area immediately after

C. January 23, 2012 Work Session

- Rationale for Board modifications to the proposed boundary
- Existing older subdivisions was one reason for the boundary modification
- Many of the areas included in the USMA are very rural
- How many communities within Tri-County have approved an USMA
- Experience from other communities which have successfully implemented an urban service management area
- Portland, Oregon as the "poster child" for the urban service boundary
- Examples of well-known Michigan communities which have an urban service boundary already in place are Traverse City, Grand Rapids, Eaton Rapids, Frankenmuth and Saginaw
- Additional example of a well-known community outside of Michigan which has an urban service boundary already in place is Lexington, Kentucky
- Each example given was a city and cities have control of their utilities and extension of those utilities
- Annexations should be part of the urban service management area discussion
- Information on Township annexations would be beneficial for discussion

10. Township Board, Planning Commission officer, committee chair, and staff comment or reports

Commissioner Honicky inquired of staff as to the rationale for deviation to the regular Planning Commission meeting dates of the second and fourth Mondays in February and November, 2012.

Principal Planner Oranchak responded a February 28, 2012 Presidential Primary conflicts with the Planning Commission's use of the Town Hall Room, so the date was changed to February 20, 2012. She added that Veteran's Day will be celebrated on the second Monday in November, which necessitated moving the date from November 12th to November 19th.

11. New applications (None)

12. Site plans received (None)

13. Site plans approved (None)

14. Public remarks

Chair Deits opened and closed public remarks.

15. Adjournment

Chair Deits adjourned the regular meeting at 9:30 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sandra K. Otto
Recording Secretary