

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MERIDIAN
PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION MINUTES
MARCH 12, 2012**

APPROVED

**5151 Marsh Road, Okemos, MI 48864-1198
Town Hall Room, 517-853-4560**

PRESENT: Chair Deits, Vice-Chair Jackson, Commissioners Goodale, Hildebrandt, Norkin, Scales and Scott-Craig
ABSENT: Secretary Cordill and Commissioner Honicky
STAFF: Principal Planner Gail Oranchak
PUBLIC: None

1. Call meeting to order

Chair Deits called the work session meeting to order at approximately 7:00 P.M.

2. Approval of agenda

3. Public Remarks

None

4. Discussion

A. 2005 Master Plan Update

- Recommend re-writing Goal 5, Objective A, Strategy 1 to read: “Focus growth in an urban service area to insure efficient use of public services” to focus on where services will be
- Recommend re-writing Goal 7, Objective C, to read, “Define and urban service area to promote walkable community development and improve existing developed areas through redevelopment.
- Include “efficient and sustainable growth processes”
- “Adopt and urban service boundary to make the most efficient use of current infrastructure capacity.”
- Create a growth area not a boundary
- Define redevelopment for example L&L becoming Tom’s or gas station becomes Walgreens
- Smart Growth America statistics on the costs of growth: extension of roads, water, sewer
- Focus attention on the most efficient use of resources
- People care about the cost of growth, not the growth itself
- Community is burdened even though large new homes on large lots bring in higher tax dollars
- Frontal cortex blog: importance of human interaction to creativity
- Ideal life style is changing; five to ten year horizon
- 60 percent of people would prefer a smaller lot if they could walk to services
- Rental potential for property along the CATA bus line
- Marketing affecting change, people’s aspirations
- Greater sense of community among homeowners than renters
- Are demographics the reason for more turnover in condominiums than single-family houses?
- Who will live in the single family homes occupied by middle-aged empty nesters now?
- Future of nursing homes when baby boomers are gone

- Prefer “urban service district” over “urban service boundary” or “urban service management area”
- Board changes to the boundary are not that great, no recommendation for change
- Outside district not committed to extending services
- Existence of services a built in incentive to developing in the urban service district
- Goal 5, Objective A, Strategy 1, “Focus growth into and urban service district to insure efficient and fiscally responsible use of public services”
- Goal 7, Objective C: “Define and urban service district to promote walkable community development and dynamic community improvement through redevelopment”
- Goal 5, Objective A, Strategy 1: Replace “enforce” with “promote”
- Chapter 8 narrative: Before “In May 2011” the term is “urban service boundary” after the term is “urban service district”
- Chapter 10, replace “boundary” with “district”
- Update demographics from new numbers from Tri-County Regional Planning Commission
- Add sentence, “Most recent data shows even these projections are unlikely to be met.”
- Occasional, deliberate and fair process to change the urban service district boundary
- Industrial use does not make sense at Grand River and Dawn Avenue
- Arrow point suggestions
- “Boundary line should be compact and easily defined”
- “Changes should be contiguous with the existing district”
- Eliminate the second to last arrow in the first section of arrows
- Big shift, no longer assumption the township will grow with new residential development, redevelopment is a priority, walkable communities on horizon started with 2005 Master Plan
- Away from subdivisions and cars to infill, redevelopment and smart growth
- What is the percent of land outside the urban services district
- Prefer compact development shaped like a sphere not an octopus
- Retain “compact”
- “Property under the same ownership” should not be a criteria
- Next set of five
- “Proximity to urban service area”
- Fifth arrow “Expenditures will not result in increased economic burden for the Township”
- Keep second to last arrow, standard planning practice
- Change “will” to “shall”
- Person requesting amendment to the boundary must show it will not be a burden
- Extensions shall be for the benefit of the Township
- Add “location in relation to the existing urban service district”
- Encourage concurrency for procedural reasons but not as a criteria for yes or no
- Locate earlier in the document something like, “The Planning Commission will evaluate the proposed amendment using criteria established and submit a recommendation”
- No suitable development site
- “Documentation of health and/or safety issue exists a requirement whether public or private initiation of change to boundary
- Add, “Consistency with the orderly development of township infrastructure”
- Revise third arrow to read, “Documentation from the applicant that there is a compelling health and/or safety issue”
- Chair Deits will e-mail changes to staff
- Staff will prepare a recommendation to the Township Board for adoption at the March 26 meeting

5. Public remarks

None

6. Adjournment

Chair Deits adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Gail Oranchak, AICP
Principal Planner