

**PLANNING COMMISSION
BUSINESS MEETING AGENDA
FINAL**

Monday, January 19, 2009

CALL TO ORDER: 7:30 P.M.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

PUBLIC COMMENT: Items Not On Agenda

CONSENT AGENDA:

- a.) Minutes of December 15, 2008
- b.) Communications:
 - 1.) Holly Township Letter re: Draft Master Plan
 - 2.) Letter from Edge Consulting Engineers, re: Public Notice SBA

PUBLIC HEARING:

- OLD BUSINESS:
- 1.) SBA Tower – Final Site Plan Review
 - 2.) Master Plan Update Phase II - Final Review
 - 3.) Amendments to Zoning Ordinance No. 26 – Landscape Provisions
 - 4.) Planning Commission By-Laws
 - 5.) Dixie Corridor Study Update
 - 6.) Capitol Improvement Plan

NEW BUSINESS

- 1. Election of Officers
- 2. Procedural Changes

OTHER BUSINESS: 1. Priority List

PUBLIC COMMENT:

ADJOURNMENT:

NEXT MEETING DATE(s): February 16, 2009 Business Meeting

The Mission of the Springfield Township Planning Commission is to guide and promote the efficient, coordinated development of the Township in a manner that will best promote the health, safety, and welfare of its people.

**Springfield Township
Planning Commission -- Business Meeting
Minutes of January 19, 2009**

Call to Order: Chair John Steckling called the January 19, 2009 Business Meeting of the Springfield Township Planning Commission to order at 7:30 p.m. at the Springfield Township Civic Center, 12000 Davisburg Rd., Davisburg, MI 48350

Attendance:

Commissioners Present

Frank Aiello
Ruth Ann Hines
Roger Lamont
Bill Leddy
John Steckling
Neil Willson

Commissioners Absent

Dean Baker

Staff Present

Mike Trout, Supervisor

Consultants Present

Sally Elmiger
Randall Ford

Approval of Agenda

Chairman Steckling recommended moving SBA Tower under: No. 1, New Business to No. 1, Old Business and leave the remaining agenda as is. The Planning Commissioners agreed.

Chairman Steckling moved to approve the Agenda as amended. Support by Commissioner Lamont. Vote on the motion: Ayes: Aiello, Hines, Lamont, Leddy, Steckling and Willson. Nays: None. Absent: Baker Motion Carried.

Public Comment:

None.

Consent Agenda:

Commissioner Aiello moved to approve the Consent Agenda with the notation of bolding the Motion made by Commission Lamont in the December 15, 2008 minutes on page 7, 5th paragraph, for consistency purposes. Supported by Commissioner Leddy. Vote on the motion: Ayes: Aiello, Hines, Lamont, Leddy, Steckling and Willson. Nays: None. Absent: Baker. Motion Carried.

- a) **Approval of Minutes: December 15, 2008 Business Meeting.**
- b) **Receipt of Communications:**
 - i.) **Holly Township Letter re: Draft Master Plan**
 - ii.) **Letter from Edge Consulting Engineers, re: Public Notice SBA**

Public Hearing:

None.

Old Business:

1. SBA Tower – Final Site Plan Review

Ellen Tencer introduced herself, representing SBA, 5030 Cooley Lake Road, Waterford, MI, 48327.

Chairman Steckling stated that Ellen Tencer was before the Commission last month with the Concept Site Plan and at that time the Planning Commission recommended to the Township Board that it be approved for Special Land Use subject to the variance request on the setback from the Zoning Board of Appeals for the height and based on our documents the ZBA granted that relief. The Public Hearing was held, the Township Board granted Special Land Use, now SBA is here for consideration of Final Site Plan. At the initial meeting there were items requested to be considered and items addressed by the consultants as to specifics. Chairman Steckling requested Ellen Tencer to present any unresolved items from the consultants at this time.

Ellen Tencer stated there were only two unresolved items. One is the landscaping. What we would like to recommend is, in the spring time that Sally Elmiger stop by and if she feels more trees are needed, we will put in a few more trees. There are woods directly behind the tower site and there are woods next to the site also, so adding more trees may or may not be required. Maybe some of the money paid in for the reviews could cover a site visit for one of the consultants. MDOT also has a landscape expert that usually requires trees, which would cover some of the additional trees.

The second item is the water detention. The entire site already flows on to the neighboring property and that what we will be doing is so minor that it will be only a very small amount of water that would be diverted into the wooded area. I understand that the Township's Ordinance requires that the water be kept on the State property and we would propose to have the Township Engineer work with the SBA Consultant along with the State. The State requires involvement where detention ponds or the possible use of permeable surfaces are being looked at. This will require time and getting three engineers together to come up with the best solution. I understand that Randy Ford spoke with our expert today, and they have already come up with a couple of ideas that might work, but they will have to be cleared by MDOT first. I will check into whether there is an existing storm water system already on site we could tie into or check for a location for a detention pond. I believe these items are fairly minor and could be handled later on during the construction process.

Randy Ford was asked to address his report. Randy stated most of the issues are relatively minor such as bookkeeping type items, but questioned the letter from the Registered PE, stated he hadn't seen the sealed document, which the ordinance requires. Ellen replied that it was in the 2nd packet submitted.

Supervisor Trout stated that it was submitted with the packet for the Special Land Use.

Randy Ford noted that he received the Phase I Environmental Review and the Geo-Technical Report with soil boring data. Randy then addressed the drainage. He agreed with Ellen Tencer that there wasn't a real significant issue with this site. The compound that they are proposing with the grass paver type driveway, a few concrete pads for supporting some of the equipment, does not involve a huge change nor will it create a lot of additional runoff generated from these impervious areas and believes it will be rather nominal. Regardless the Township Design Standards requires in any

development that the runoff has be accommodated within the development, either by a detention facility or retention facility. Randy stated that he had spoken with the SBA engineer, because the current plan submitted doesn't address that requirement. The Concept Plan showed an area to the north, listed as a water basin, without showing any detail, and I believe the current plan is trying to show what the increased runoff was going to be, but they eliminated the basin not addressing the retention requirement. I made some suggestions on how to accomplish the requirement, and I don't believe it will require a hugh deep basin but, they still will be required to hold back any increased runoff, detain it and then allow it to discharge on to the adjacent property at the preexisting or agricultural rate of discharge and I believe we can get there. Randy then stated that on the drawing there is an area of a "lease" area indicated, but I don't think the lease area that is fenced, is going to give them the room or the area they need to accomplish this detention facility. There is a fairly flat grassed area toward the driveway out front that could possibly work well, but SBA will also have to work with MDOT and make arrangements to utilize some additional property for the storm water management, and depending on the Planning Commission comfort level and feel that we can work that out administratively that is fine, and he would certainly follow-up and review any construction drawings forwarded to him. The swale along the fence line needs to be pulled into the area being discussed. I do not envision a large basin and that is the only thing left to be address on the site.

Sally Elmiger was asked to comment on any items of concern. She questioned if the access area was sufficient for fire trucks and if the Fire Chief could look at the configuration and let us know

Supervisor Trout stated that he spoke with the Fire Chief, and he had affirmed that the width was adequate as that fire trucks, most likely, wouldn't be driving back into that area, but they would access the area on foot. Sally responded all right.

Sally then stated that one main issue on the landscaping requirement is the screening of the residential parcels to the east. It is very possible that the wooded area will be sufficient; however, the screen has to be on the applicants parcel, which would be within the MDOT parcel. If the fence is on the edge of the MDOT parcel and the woods are on the adjacent parcel, this will not meet the ordinance requirements. I did suggest in my review a site inspection, after construction is under way, to verify the opacity and location of the woodlands, and then we can look at the screening to the residential pieces.

Sally had a couple of other issues under the requirements of the ordinance, still needing to be addressed. First a description of how security will be handled, in case the facility is no longer in use is still required, and second is providing the name(s), address and phone number for the contact person for Engineering Maintenance and other notice purposes. Ellen Tencer stated she did provide a Removal Bond example to Supervisor Trout just before the meeting along with copies of the lease with the State of Michigan, and the contact information requested. Sally had no other comments.

Commissioner Lamont asked Supervisor Trout if he was able to determine if he had the signed, sealed engineering letter. Supervisor Trout responded yes. Commissioner Lamont then asked Randy if he believed that administratively, working with the Township and the applicant, that he could resolve the drainage issues. Randy response was yes. Commissioner Aiello wanted to ensure all ordinance requirements would have to be met. Commissioner Lamont agreed and items such as contour, placement, depth, slope etc., could be checked. We could look at plans all day long, but we may be looking at a clay mound instead of a sand mound and might only have to be half the size. If a field visit is done along with meeting the other engineer this maybe could be determined easier.

Randy Ford stated the onsite soils, showed a boring in the general area indicating approximately 4 foot of clay and then there is some pretty permeable material and I suggested to their engineer that they either cut down thru the clay to the sand layer, or put in a leaching basin in the bottom to take advantage of the permeable soils. Commission Lamont stated he had seen the soils report and agreed.

Commissioner Lamont then verified with Sally that she preferred to look at the site during construction versus stating they have to plant how many trees to plant at this time. Sally agreed that it made more sense to see what is on site after they have some of the facilities constructed to see what the impact is going to be from the adjacent properties and how much screening is there currently.

Commissioner Lamont stated he didn't consider a tower to be a normal structure. It is going to be very narrow, have a fence around it and if Sally went to the site it would be easier to verify where the appropriate plantings would need to be installed.

Commissioner Lamont asked Randy if verification of the height of the tower had been addressed as questioned in his review. Randy stated that Ellen Tencer had addressed it during the Concept Review. Commissioner Lamont stated for clarification purposes that the height of the tower is going to be 150' with a 7' lighting rod, with the total height being 157'.

Sally Elmiger wanted the Commission to remember that this is a recommendation to the Township Board and that they have the ultimate decision on the screening so making a specific recommendation would be appropriate.

Commissioner Lamont moved to approve recommendation to approve the SBA Tower to the Township Board for Final Site Plan. Plan received date stamped 1-9-09, conditioned upon the following:

- **That the Township Engineer and the Township Representative ensure that the drainage requirement for onsite detention meets ordinance requirements and to be handled administratively and;**
- **That the Final Township Body, that being the Township Board, administratively, in conjunction with the applicant, satisfy Section 16.06, Landscaping Requirement, during the construction process in order to meet the ordinance requirements and;**

It appears that the applicant has met all other applicant requirements including the sealed engineered plan that was required and has a ZBA variance for the tower to be located closer to the lot line that ordinance permits. Supported by Commissioner Aiello.

Vote on the motion: Ayes: Aiello, Hines, Lamont, Leddy, Steckling and Willson. No: None. Absent: Baker. Motion Carried.

Ellen Tencer thanked the Commission for being so professional, friendly and easy to work with.

Commissioner Lamont responded to Ellen stating that her presentations at all levels, as he also sits on the Township Board have been equally as professional and thorough.

2. Master Plan Update Phase II Final Review

Chairman Steckling stated that last month we sent the Master Plan to the Township Board with our final approval and recommendation for adoption. The Township Board after some discussion sent it back to the Commission. There was concern that it wasn't clear in terms of our intention as to how we would be dealing with environmental issues in some of the categories that we had created. I had a meeting with the consultants, supervisor, and clerk last week and Dick Carlisle recommended that we

change some of the language in the Master Plan to clarify that the Township and everyone concerned has every intention of honoring the environmental sanctity that we hold at a very high standard. This document would also clarify that regardless of the zoning, the environmental rules and guidelines would be followed, no matter which zoning category is being dealt with. You have already received those text changes and I feel they are very self-explanatory. We can agree with this, modify it, and then send it back to the Township Board and that will be our final step.

Commissioner Aiello asked Chairman Steckling to clarify the Township Boards concerns. Chair Steckling stated that the Township Board's concern was the motion last month that was passed, and the map, showing the area to the waters edge and the question was can development occur to the waters edge. Commissioner Aiello responded all right he understood. Chairman Steckling stated his thought all along, and he believes it was the thought of the majority of the commission, was that just because the parcel was Master Planned for Planned Mixed Use that you still had to follow all of the Township rules and regulations and that we had adequate protections under the MNFI rules to protect those grounds. The text changes backs up our intent on that. The motion last month is not under consideration, this is just additional clarification of our intents.

Commissioner Hines asked if the Township Board had reviewed the Future Land Use map. She stated that the Resource Conservation issue has her in knots.

Supervisor Trout stated that no, the entire Township Board has not seen the map, because it was agreed to in their meeting it would probably be better presented with some language that emphasized the protection of the areas, and that was the only reason that we recommended it come back to the Planning Commission. I can't speak for the Township Board but I believe these changes are acceptable, at least to those that have seen it. Resource Conservation is not being impacted in that particular change and one of the things that we made very clear was that in a Planned Mixed Use development that flexibility is enhanced not only by the Township but the property owner with the fact there are natural features to the property and they can be incorporated into that Planned Mixed Use in an appropriate way and that is why this seemed like the best approach.

Commissioner Hines stated that when she looks at the map she sees one parcel where we have done this and there is property like this all over the Township and there is acreage behind her house with a creek running through with wetlands and it is all residential. This seems totally inconsistent and I am afraid of what it might create and that was why she wondered if the Township Board had seen this or if she was the only one having this issue. We have wetlands and water all over this Township and we are not addressing and Resource Conservation issues in other areas.

Chairman Steckling stated that this does not change the motion of last month in terms of the map.

Commissioner Hines again wanted to know if this has gone to the Township Board or if this was going to become part of a document without review.

Chairman Steckling stated that he was sure that the clerk will address this section of the map during her review.

Commissioner Hines then stated that if they are going to do this the Board had better look at the property behind her and areas with acreage and water around, and that it is not consistently portrayed on this Future Land Use Map and if that is what this map is going to be, we need to get a fine point pencil on it.

Sally said the properties along Dixie Highway are very unique in that they have a major road corridor fronting the property whereas Commissioner Hines' parcel does not. Dixie has the unusual combination of a highly traveled road, very developable land, and very unique environmental situations. These factors come together making those parcels more unique. Dick Carlisle also agreed that it wasn't inappropriate to identify these areas in a unique fashion rather than other areas of the Township. Residential development is not nearly as impactful, in general, as what is being proposed, and that is what the Township thinks is important and appropriate in this location.

Commissioner Hines again stated that she felt that the map does not consistently represent issues on Resource Conservation. Chairman Steckling said he didn't disagree with Commissioner Hines, but he is also looking at the language and it merely states what I believe is already in our ordinances and rules and just restates it. That is why he didn't have a problem with it, but I didn't believe it could be dealt with at this time.

Commissioner Hines asked if the Township Board could deal with it.

Commissioner Lamont stated he would comment to the Township Board and that he has been on the Township Board for 4 years and they have been nothing but thorough, and he assured the Commission that the Township Board will look at it, each bringing their own opinions, and what the outcome will be is unknown.

Commissioner Lamont felt in regards particularly to the boundary of three maps; Future Land Use, Bridge Valley MNFI Resource Conservation and the Dixie Overlay District should be compared and his thought was if we move the line for Future Land Use, then we may need to reevaluate where the lines are for the Dixie Highway Overlay map as there could be a part of a Future Land Use that might not be within both areas. It might be MNFI and not part of the Dixie Highway Overlay District and we might end up with a 100' sliver that isn't covered by anything.

Commissioner Hines asked Commissioner Lamont if his question, submitted in his comments, had been addressed regarding which document had final authority.

Sally stated the Master Plan is a general guide to land use within the community. Your Zoning Ordinance regulates how development happens on each parcel. The Zoning Ordinance should be consistent with the Master Plan and the process is generally done by consulting the Master Plan first and then reviewing the Zoning Ordinance to make sure that what is being regulated within the Zoning Ordinance is consistent with the intentions that were communicated through the Master Plan. The Master Plan map is not a zoning map even though the Master Plan map may say Residential, the Zoning map could still say Commercial because of the existing land use.

Commissioner Aiello said he is not the Township Attorney but as a Planning Commissioner with a legal background it is my understanding, as a citizen, that when and if the actions as a Planning Commission are challenged legally, the basis upon which they can be challenged is whether or not we were acting under a constitutional standard, which is called rational basis. Did we have a rational basis for the action or legislation that we undertook, and that is generally a deferential standard to a body like the Planning Commission. We are given a lot of leeway but one of the easy ways to show what we are doing was not connected or not consistent with rational basis scrutiny is if our Master Plan is inconsistent with what we are doing. It would give someone challenging our Ordinance the ability to say you had a different plan and you acted inconsistent with the plan that you had. That rule

serves as a shield, this is what we had planned and this is how we are going to act in the future. Going back to the map, and my concern before, I felt that when we extended the line of the Planned Mixed Use designation to the waterline, we were saying we believe development can happen up to the waterline. So even though we have ordinances on the books that say you must stay so many feet from the wetlands, here it looks like it says our vision for the future is that development happen right up to the waterline, so in the future when we get a PUD and we say no, you have to have a green buffer of so many feet, and the developer challenges the density and as part of that challenge states the Master Plan said that development could happen up to the wetland line, and the Court, based on rational basis scrutiny determines the Planning Commission is not acting rationally. That was my concern when we looked at the map, but we are past the map, and I hope that the Township Board would look closely at the map and possibly reconsider the line as I feel that something gets lost between the Master Plan and the ordinance requirements.

Commissioner Aiello moved the changes as presented to the Planning Commission be recommended to the Township Board in the Master Plan Draft that they are receiving. Supported by Commissioner Lamont.

Commissioner Lamont stated that although Chairman Steckling thought the changes were innocuous the discussion is when the Planned Mixed Use line on the map was altered the discussion whether we were acting as Commissioner Aiello stated, acting rationally came into the discussion and the question as to which document has final authority, the Zoning Ordinance or the Master Plan, finding out they work harmoniously. It was also pointed out that each parcel of land is totally unique, and the parcels being addresses are on a five lane State/County main high traffic artery, where other parcels with the same designation may be on a low traveled County two lane road, they may be Master Planned for the same use such as Rural Residential and we might end up with a totally different designation. So every parcel is unique and I believe that the language changes that are before the Commission right now in Commissioner Aiello's motion, will solidify the intent of the Commission, the intent of the Township, that although it is Future Land Use planned for Planned Mix Use, it is the intent of the Township that where significant environmental features exist such as MNFI as sited on page 43 in the text changes, these environmental features be protected and integrated into the Planned Mixed Use Design. Which by example, could permit an applicant to have an overlook, maybe some nature paths for a possible senior home, as here at the Township which allows people to enjoy the natural beauty surrounding them, created with impervious surface within those areas, which would be my vision. Overlooks add to the beauty of the land as well as the value of the land and there is a lot of value to these text changes, and after the meeting I felt we came away, in my opinion, with a solid plan and a win.

Chairman Steckling stated that he agreed with Commissioner Hines and that he was remiss in looking at this and he thanked the landowners for asking a very simple question, who came up with this line. Prior to that time I also saw the line but didn't pay particular attention, as the maps are hard to identify where it crosses somebody's property boundary or is within the boundary. My thought is going forward, and there has to be a way down the road, where we cannot get ourselves in trouble by violating the Master Plan but maybe through some ordinance language allow for some flexibility that we need, for example if we have a parcel that has a zoning other than Recreation Conservation, where there is conflicting Master Planning zoning on the parcel, that some language in the ordinance that we have some latitude to take in consideration both features and maybe make a judgment, as done with Zoning Board of Appeals situations, and then maybe we wouldn't be totally knocked out of

entertaining a good development, but we are not put in the position of always compromising our Master Plan. I have to believe legislatively we could come up with something to do that. If not we will always be wrestling with this and if nothing else we have been educated on this and we need to keep moving forward and come up with a good resolution.

Supervisor Trout asked Sally that if this goes to the Township Board and the Township Board does want to modify it somehow, does it come back to the Planning Commission. Sally responded it doesn't have to, but the Township Board out of courtesy could send it back. Supervisor Trout stated he felt that the Master Plan was very close, but he had been approached about a residential parcel on Andersonville Road that butts up to Industrial with manufacturing right next to it, and the proposal of the property is for Office use, and it makes sense, and there are other areas, such as downtown Davisburg, that need to be looked at and how extensive of a change can the Township Board make without asking Planning Commission their opinion.

Sally responded that the Township Board is the ultimate authority and can approve the Master Plan anyway they see fit and just because you adopt your Master Plan it doesn't mean you can't amend it. You can always come back to it. You may wish to adopt it and get it on the books and come back to it, as 90 percent of it is fine. Supervisor Trout just wanted clarification.

Vote on the motion to recommend text changes to the Township Board, as submitted by Carlisle Wortman: Ayes: Aiello, Hines, Lamont, Leddy, Steckling and Willson. Nays: None. Absent: Baker. Motion Carried.

4. Amendments to Zoning Ordinance – Landscape Provisions

Chairman Steckling stated this has been seen a number of times. It has gone to Public Hearing and came back last month and was tabled for the portion dealing with Prohibited Plant Species. At that time we entertained adopting by reference someone's standards. Chairman Steckling referenced the e-mail received from Clerk Moreau stating that she spoke with the doctor, from MSU that visited last month, and their final list will not be completed until January 29, 2009. We can do a number of things this evening. Chairman Steckling then stated he still had issues with the Natural Landscaping and the procedure. I am ambivalent on the standard for the prohibited plants and would like to wait and see the list shows and if it can be incorporated and if it is a meaningful way to go.

Commissioner Leddy stated he felt no action should be taken until the report is received.

Commissioner Leddy moved to table the Amendments to the Zoning Ordinance – Landscape Provisions until next month. Supported by Commissioner Aiello. Vote on the Motion: Ayes: Aiello, Hines, Lamont, Leddy, Steckling and Willson. Nays. None. Absent: Baker. Motion Carried.

5. Planning Commission By-Laws

Chairman Steckling said Collin Walls started the By-laws quite sometime ago. Collin ran out of time and I said I would take over, as I needed something to follow. I made some changes to it, nothing really major except for removing the first paragraph dealing with the "Purpose of the Commission" as

it was redundant and is listed in the Michigan Enabling Act and statute and this is more for procedural guidance. There appears to be clerical error on numbering and I will correct that. Commissioner Leddy asked if the By-Laws had been compared to the new Michigan Enabling rules and regulations for a Planning Commission and felt they should be looked at.

Supervisor Trout said he felt it was appropriate for the Commission to discuss any specific concerns that you have at this point and then have Greg Need and Carlisle Wortman look at these. Commissioner Lamont commented he was going to suggest that to Greg Need.

Chairman Steckling stated he believed it had already been dealt with as Greg Needs office basically did this document. Sally Elmiger also commented that she had a copy that requested to send comments back to Greg Need.

Commissioner Aiello stated he wanted to be able to accommodate Chairman Steckling request regarding the agenda and putting items that are of greater public interest or greater consultant interest at the beginning of the agenda. I am unsure if that would be just Site Plans or other issues, but maybe Under the Order of Business, Section 4.5 this could be dealt with before Old Business.

Chairman Steckling suggested a note at the bottom that this is a normal agenda. When the following items present themselves on the agenda, they will be given priority. Then we could list Site Plans or other items and this would be subjective not mandatory but give us leeway.

Commissioner Lamont stated that he believed the Order of Business followed Roberts Rules. When he was chairman a couple of years ago, the agendas did not follow the order of the Township Board and I recommended and this Commission approved, that we follow the same order of business, as the Township Board. I don't know if we have the latitude to change those and Greg should look at that, but my other thought was to move Other Business ahead of Old and New Business and if we have Site Plans or large audiences they could be simply listed under Other and again would need to be verified. This would then allow a Site Plan having a Public Hearing to be dealt with right after Public Comments and not later on under the agenda. If Other was moved maybe the Chairman could work with the creator of the Agenda to make sure those items appear in an efficient manner and then we don't have to adjust the agenda at meeting time.

Commissioner Aiello stated that Section 4, says the Township Clerk or designee with the assistance of the Supervisor shall prepare the agenda and maybe that should be with the assistance of the Supervisor and the Planning Commission Chairperson, so whoever the Planning Commission chairperson is can be thinking about those sorts of considerations ahead of time.

Commissioner Leddy agrees that changing the Agenda at the beginning of the meeting is not the ideal situation.

Supervisor Trout wanted to point out that Planning and Zoning are his responsibilities and perhaps he should be responsible for the agenda and I think Clerk Moreau could assist me as it is her job to post it and things like that, and I am suggesting that it might be more appropriate and I could work with the Chairman to ensure the items that have been discussed are in the appropriate order. He noted that Public Hearing was missing under the Order of Business section of the By-Laws.

Commissioner Aiello said he noticed that the end of Section 3, "no member of the public shall speak twice on any subject manner unless authorized by the Chairman", had been removed and he liked that

clause. Chairman Steckling stated he didn't realize it had been removed and would not have done that and would put it back in when it was then discovered that portion was repetitious, and the reason for being removed.

Commissioner Hines stated that there were Township Board Operating Rules of Procedure noted, we have Planning Commission Rules of Procedures in addition to Robert's Rules of Procedure and then the By-Laws and I would like to review them all together to make sure are consistently moving us in the same direction on operating procedures. Good point stated Commissioner Lamont and as a note it would be nice to have this information posted on the website as well. Commissioner Hines inquired if these documents were available in a word document format that could be e-mailed to the Commission.

Supervisor Trout stated yes and that the Township Board Rules of Procedures had just been amended at the last Township Board meeting and would see they all receive the Planning Commission Rules of Procedure, the Township Board Operating Rules of Procedures and a clean copy of the By-Laws for comparison as requested by Commissioner Hines.

Supervisor Trout said there were no Planning Commission Rules of Procedure, just Township Board.

Chairman Steckling said he thought that the Commission had adopted the Township Board Rules of Procedure so this should probably be taken out of the By-Laws.

Commissioner Aiello said that if we have adopted the Township Rules of Procedure as our own then why would we have duplications of that in our By-Laws, and that just leads to the possibility of it being inconsistent, as is the agenda order and maybe we should even have an agenda order list in our By-Laws. Chairman Steckling responded we could just say we are not going to adopt the Township's rules and have our own. Commissioner Lamont said then the Commission should look at those and make that decision or say we adopt the Township Rules of Procedures with those exceptions or additions.

Commissioner Aiello moved to table the By-laws for information to be provided by the Township Supervisor as requested. Supported by Commissioner Hines. Vote of the Motion: Ayes: Aiello, Hines, Lamont, Leddy, Steckling, and Willson. Nays: None. Absent: Baker. Motion Carried.

Commissioner Lamont wished to clarify that the requested documents would come in their next packets. Supervisor Trout stated yes.

Supervisor Trout asked if everyone had seen Commissioner Lamont's e-mail regarding the agenda in terms of actions. Commissioner Lamont stated that this was something that was discussed with Collin a few times in the past year, that it might be helpful if on the agenda, after each topic, there would be an action line indented. Chairman Steckling suggested that we add that to the Procedural Changes, No. 3, New Business.

6. Dixie Corridor Study Update

Sally Elmiger said this draft was developed with the help of a Steering Committee of business and property owners along Dixie Highway made up of approximately 8 people. The intent of the document is to update the Dixie Corridor Study not to do a new one. The Steering Committee looked

at what their Priority Items were and what they thought of the Goals and Policies in the Dixie Corridor Study, and would they update them if you wanted to, and so we did. In the Summary of Significant Findings you will find the three top priorities; sewer and water along the corridor, improved lighting and a traffic study were the things they really felt, if the Corridor was to improve and be developed into the commercial core that the community sees, they were going to need these things. On pages 5 and 6, you will find the new Goals and Policies on the Dixie Corridor area. Some of the goals were maintained, some were eliminated and some are new. The Boulevard Concept has been further refined, based on the new geometry of the roadway and is now included in this plan. There will a better graphic included in the final study rather than the one you are reviewing now. The last thing on Page 9, we provided some descriptions and some possible implementation mechanisms that the Township might want to consider, which are ways to organize people and money so potential projects might be able to be conceptualized, further developed and then hopefully implemented. The index of the document includes some actual results of a Visioning meeting that was conducted and the resources used for the implementation mechanisms. Carlisle Wortman is finalizing the graphics and will send to the Committee Members for their final input. Sally then asked Supervisor Trout where it went from here.

Supervisor Trout said that he felt the draft captures about everything the Committee discussed. We are now at the point where this Body can now look at this and say we are headed in the right direction. One of the things that came out of that meeting was the Boulevard. The Boulevard was proposed as something that would enhance the Corridor, but its cost is prohibitive and until we can afford to put in a decent boulevard we felt it was more appropriate to use elements of a boulevard to enhance the safety in traffic flow and other items in more specific terms. I have requested from HRC a proposal for the area from Big Lake Road to Davisburg Road in terms of what can we do that will identify Capital Improvements that can be made, and tied specifically to this Capital Plan so know what we are looking at, but it is really a Safety Study. I want them to look at signals, signage, the boulevard and anything else that could relate to the flow of traffic and access to that area including the highway interchange and perhaps the relocation of Big Lake Road, and some of these other items that keep hanging out there. If the Commission could agree that we are headed in the right direction with this I am going to start pursuing more specific type of actions. It doesn't necessarily need approval but I wanted you to know that we were working on it.

Chairman Steckling said he would like to see the Commission pursue this concept so we can be prepared versus looking at requests one at a time. Commissioner Hines concurred.

Commissioner Lamont thanked all involved and said good job and he looked forward to updates.

7. Capital Improvement Plan

Supervisor Trout said he is working on the text of the plan but wanted to see something concrete that was easy to read broken down, year by year and developed the spreadsheet and requested input on the format.

Commissioner Aiello asked if it was normal to purchase fire trucks every year. Supervisor Trout responded that it was when there hadn't been any purchased in the last 15 years and that vehicles had not been replaced on a regular basis to this point and his background was in Public Safety, and he had always been used to replacing things even sooner than this and I would like to see a 10 year replacement cycle where some of the vehicles are 20 years old.

Commissioner Aiello asked for an explanation regarding the wind turbines, recycling center and the solar system listed on the spreadsheet. Supervisor Trout said it kind of nebulous at this point. It is more of an opportunity to look at alternative energy as a study that might identify these wind turbines, solar or geo-thermal opportunities that we could possibly incorporate into some of the building improvements that we are also proposing such as the Parks Building or the Fire Station relocations. I am not sure but I know the future is in this area. Commissioner Aiello stated he was very happy to see them listed.

Commissioner Lamont thanked Supervisor Trout on his efforts and hard work and it was nice to have a document that was easy to read. He questioned why the Park's portion was left blank. Supervisor Trout said he had just received two years of information but the Park Commission wishes to have more discussion for the future years, so they provided 2009 and 2010 information only at this time.

New Business:

1. Election of Officers

Chairman Steckling explained that last month according to the By-Laws we were required to nominate officers and at this meeting required to elect them.

Commissioner Aiello moved to approve the slate provided at last meeting of John Steckling as Chairman, Dean Baker as Vice Chairman and Ruth Hines as Secretary. Supported by: Commissioner Leddy. Vote on the Motion: Ayes: Aiello, Hines, Lamont, Leddy, Steckling, and Willson. Nays: None. Absent: Baker. Motion Carried.

Commissioner Lamont was excused at 9:05 p.m.

2. Procedural Changes

Chairman Steckling stated in the packets were some of his suggestions and are fairly self-explanatory and that his goal is to streamline some of our functions both internally on our meetings and our operations with the Township and also maybe streamline some of the workings between applicants and our professionals to eliminate wasted time. I did not plan on discussing these this evening, but ask for questions, comments and thoughts from the Commissioners as to changes and get them to somebody and design a master list. Maybe at the next meeting establish a priority list and then begin working on them. On the motions I would like you to be as specific as possible on the motion wording to preserve a good record for posterity or in the event we have litigation in the future and would like to see the section of the ordinance referenced or sited in the motion we have a nice clean record going forward. I also added Commissioner Lamont's comment regarding adding an action line to the agenda to be looked at. This should be placed on the Priority List to be taken up at a later time.

Commissioner Hines said if suggestions were being taken that she would like to see a procedure where we have a specific or organized walk of property when dealing with site plans or issues on the agenda that deal with specific properties. We have met on occasion as a Commission and it helped so much to clarify the details of the request along with existing conditions etc. Chairman Steckling will add to the list.

Commissioner Aiello said he had a couple of suggestions but would not go over them now but wished to applaud the efforts and the great ideas and would like to ask Sally and Brian for any thoughts or

suggestions regarding best practices, since they deal with multiple Planning Commissions. Brian Oppmann agreed to follow up with Dick Carlisle.

Other Business

1. Priority List

Chairman Steckling reviewed the list and went over items, and discussed the Ground Sign and the follow up by Carlisle Wortman. Supervisor Trout will follow up on this item. The other items will be carried over with the removal of the SBA Tower and the addition of Procedural Changes, Cell Tower Setback Requirements, where we continually have to grant a variance, then we maybe need to rethink our ordinance and possibly revise the standard and is at least worth discussing. The second item would be screening requirements. Divine Mercy brought this to light, were there is a unique situation where they have a lot of abutting residential property that potentially has be screened by ordinance and I see it getting to be extremely expensive and maybe there is natural or other reasons why we should have some latitude to say we can lower the trees or do something, but right now we don't have that latitude and would like to look at some provisions within the ordinance that would allow that.

Public Comment: None

Adjournment:

- **Commissioner Aiello moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:15 p.m. Support by Commissioner Hines. Vote on the Motion: Yes: Aiello, Hines, Leddy, Steckling and Willson. Nays: None. Absent: Baker, Lamont. Motion Carried.**

Onalee M. Carnes, Recording Secretary