

DRAFT
WHITEWATER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING – MASTER PLAN
MINUTES OF JANUARY 11, 2012, SPECIAL MEETING

Call to Order by Zakrajsek at 7:00 pm

Roll Call: Boyd, Zakrajsek, Miller, Link, Mangus, Lyons, Recording Secretary-MacLean,
Zoning Administrator-Meyers + 4 audience
Absent: Dean

Set/Adjust Agenda: None

Conflict of Interest: None declared

Public Comment: None

Special Meeting Business:

Master Plan: Mangus had submitted language for the “What is a Master Plan”, it is included to review. Answers to the four questions are in the plan. Goals are now part 2. **Keep Part 1 as the Introduction. Go over the excerpt from Mangus: Proposed slightly different wording. Two statements conflict. Mangus read through her “What is a Master Plan?” Go with the statement as presented, including the last statement which then eliminates the 4 questions. Consensus!

Clarification on a plan vs. a master plan.

Natural features information to be moved.

Summary as part 3, no changes just moving. Location description changed. History: Added verbiage regarding Round Lake / Skegemog Lake. Removed duplication information as presented from the Historical Society. Seasonal fluctuation information – the county recognizes a 39% increase seasonal – back up documentation from the county. Dylan is coordinating maps. Trying to put a positive spin on the demographics. Mangus: The Greater Grand Traverse region does not anticipate growth due to state and economic factors. Boyd: this is background information and is outdated as soon as it is stated. Eliminate second paragraph – consensus! Formula: acreage/population. Meyers has calls into MDOT and GTC regarding studies for traffic lights, can be added to transportation section. Total mileage of M72 is 4.5 miles. Existing land use, chart added. Will add community assets. Link: add Muncie Lake trail under the parks and rec., add VASA Trail and North Country Trail has a trail-head. Make parks a section of the assets. “See Assets” instead of listing them all in both sections. Meyers will work on that. Zakrajsek: are we all good with this. Consensus!

Part 4 is the public participation section: Mangus: objection to using the summary of the summary of the survey. Include all or none, all would be a more reasonable choice. Add summary reports of the open houses. Lyons: at the end of the section refer to appendix. The Appendix should contain the full text of the things that were done. Change the Skype paragraph. Consensus!

Meyers: Survey ideas and information for the south end of township. Run through change of questions. Cost of doing the survey. Information of what Meyers found during investigation of

the numbers of parcels. Estimates a cost of \$1 to \$1.50 per survey. Comments: Boyd: do you feel this is a priority to move forward for future land use information? Meyers: was surprised with the information that came from this. Many have been affected but the majority of the people knew what was going on. Many do not know because they have not done anything with their property. Boyd: Validity of return could be very different than what we would have assumed. At this point, do not pursue this survey. If it needs to be revisited in the future then we will do so. Meyers: Possibly do a township mailing letting people know about what is going on with the Master Plan with the money instead of the smaller survey. Mangus: there were a lot of assumptions regarding the 5 acre issue. Possibly get the summary of the 5 acre issue information out to all the people requesting input from people. Boyd: we cannot definitely define what happened in the past. We have moved forward with the history and are moving forward now. Mangus: get the information out, understanding that it was all a little confusing, to show we have done our due diligence. Meyers: Do we need to do that in all of the districts? Boyd: we are belaboring this on behalf of one issue. Lay it to rest and if it becomes a public hearing issue with more than one or two people voicing concern in the future, we deal with it then. If there truly is a public uprising regarding this then we need to deal with it. Meyers: Low Density Single Family (LDSF) Residential would be a new Future Land Use designation would allow the people in that district to ask for a rezoning of their property. It gives the people the option in the future. If we just change it back it could create an uprising of different people. LDSF would be a compromise to do something about what had been done in the past. A mass rezoning could have some negative consequences. Mangus: I understand the concept of a future land use map – even changing the designation of a future land use map, it needs to be explained for those that do not understand. Meyers: More information on this subject in the Master Plan. Boyd: At the public hearing if they have an issue they will get an explanation. The LDSF does give people the opportunity to make a change if they want to, a reasonable means of moving forward on this. Meyers: The next printed mailing will go out in April and will be able to put a page in there if you would like and then we are looking at June to discuss again. It would be an information piece that gives everyone information. Boyd: make amends by moving forward. Link: we are appointed to represent the township, it looks to me that in the past it was very narrowly represented, we are doing this now to best of our ability with what we have. All for using the newsletter but we don't need to belabor. The real work is defining these, the meat is yet to come. The map is what is really going to drive the whole thing. Mangus: wants to make sure the public is informed. Link: this is where we are at today, what are we doing in the future, move forward with what we think is best. Zakrajsek: Mangus is a catalyst for getting the information out. Mangus: Let's make sure this is going out to the public before public hearing. Boyd: It appears this issue has been addressed in what is being presented. Mangus: go through a review of exactly how a future land use map works, based on a future land use map you can spot zone? Meyers: it is not spot zoning when it is part of the future land use map. It gives you the reasoning and rationale to rezone. If something is not consistent with the land use or future land use maps and it is rezoned it is considered spot zoning.

Part 5: New copy of section 5: Future land use Plan: Meyers: reading through. Future Land Use Map is a guide; it is not the existing Land Use Map. Hand out of the current Future Land Use Map. Boyd: Change the wording from 10-20 years to "future". It is time for a new Future Land Use Map, a lot has changed. Meyers: categories to be considered: Agricultural; Low Density Single Family Residential (reading through LDSF); Medium Density Single Family Residential – a designation where Ag has gone away, it will not be farmed any more (reading through MDSF) – change from 2 acres to more than 40,000 ft.; Waterfront Residential – waterfront people already realize it is different and call it what it is-may not ever have specific lot sizes; a future designation of High Density Single Family Residential – by limiting where the HDSF would be because of small lot size it will probably need sewer and water; Multiple family

designation – making it available in the future; Manufactured Home Park has to be included or a judge can, Mangus: can you combine Manufactured Home section and Multiple Family? – Meyers: it wouldn't really work; Mixed Use Village – variety of uses (take out the words “quaint appearance”). Office / Service is covered in Mixed Use; General Commercial; Limited Industrial; Recreation Conservation. Maps handed out. Meyers: Describing the hand colored blow up of the future land use map. Mangus: is it different? if it is changed then explain why. Mangus: what are the major changes? Meyers: mixed use got bigger; biggest change is calling the area south what it really is; adding the LDSF the second biggest change. Boyd: let's stop here and we can start chewing on all this new information.

Before moving to public comment, we have made some excellent strides in moving forward. Next time take 15 minutes to go through the requested changes and then work on future land use map and goals. ¼ page blurb going in the enews letter letting people know about the Draft Master Plan. February meeting has to address Evina plus attack the Master Plan again. Zakrajsek: do we want to attempt back to back meetings in February? We'll take it from there.

Public Comment Kim Halstead, new designation on the land use map, are the people going to be informed about the changes in the people's land? (There are no changes unless they request it) Cheryl Walton , 11613 Top View Dr : The 5 acre issue, need the history, not having the information is a sad excuse for how the township is run. Experience of neighbors that had a change made on their property on the guise of something innocent. Sandy Rennie spent 25 years on this commission: how the whole 5 acre issue came down, Joe Anderson wanted it; Sandy Rennie defended and organized the farmers. No body on the commission at that time lived south of 72. There should not be a 5 acre minimum lot rule. How does 5 acres fit into health, safety or welfare? Property perks or it doesn't; the health department makes that determination. No prohibition necessary. Future Land Use Map is the biggest waste of time I have seen yet. People buy their property in a certain zone with a certain expectation and what the rules are. Steve Mangus: 1214 Cerro, TC “My planning style could best be described as grass roots. . .” May 16, 2008, quote from Meyers resume. The attitude. What you need to do legally isn't important, what you do morally is the issue. If you do not make sure people are buying into your ideas you are going to end up in the same position as your predecessor. Do not wait until the Public Hearings, you need to be able to defend what you are doing. Hundreds of people will show up. You will not be able to ignore it. If it goes the way it has in the past the board members will be changed. Have a town hall meeting and get people's input directly. Don't just wait to see who shows up at the public hearing. Encourage the town hall meeting.

Motion to adjourn at 8:58 p.m. by Boyd, seconded by Lyons . MOTION CARRIED.