

DRAFT  
WHITEWATER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION  
SPECIAL MEETING – MASTER PLAN  
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 8, 2012, SPECIAL MEETING

Call to Order by Zakrajsek at 7:00 pm

**Roll Call:** Boyd, Zakrajsek, Link (late), Mangus, Dean, Lyons, Recording Secretary-MacLean, Zoning Administrator-Meyers, Ron Akers-presentation + 3 audience  
Absent: Miller

**Set/Adjust Agenda:** None

**Conflict of Interest:** None declared

**Public Comment:** None

**Special Meeting Business:**

Master Plan, specifically the Future Land Use Map and Plan. Meyers: changes made, Ron created a couple more color schemes for easier viewing and understanding. Read through of the Future Land Use Plan. Change the end of Low Density Single Family Residential (LDSFR). Add public lands and areas which will be served by improved roads in the near future. Boyd: question: terminology, does it make sense to call it a proposed future land use, rather than a future land use? Meyers: will discuss with the attorney.

Greatest change in the map is in the south section of the township. Discussion of the Future Land Use Map. Moore Rd 40 acre parcel is owned by Elk Rapids Schools, leave at RC1? Leave the one owned by the county at RC1? Should the county property, school property and junk yard property stay at RC1 instead of being changed to Low Density Single Family Residential?

Boyd: Erickson property is probably prohibited from development due to possible contaminants. The school property is developable with road frontage for 8 parcels. Meyers: they could do a PUD. The county property is not conducive to very much density. It is currently on their books for a parks development.

Boyd: do not see any problem with these designations as presented.

Mangus: are we proposing any community outreach to let people know about this proposal? Can we designate a meeting specifically for the peoples in these areas to be invited for discussion? This is going to be a contentious area.

Link: we are talking about only a third.

Mangus: I don't think we should make any major changes in the Future Land Use. Changes do not give people consistency in what they own. These are radical alterations.

Dean: I would agree if we were being more restrictive but we are opening this right up. Where in RC1 did it not become LDSFR. We are only easing the restrictions.

Boyd: Vaughn owns 7 acres, he cannot split. Vaughn: it could be a big change. We have ignored question 20 of the survey.

Link: the county has done surveys and they show a majority of people wanting to keep rural community character.

From the audience: Vaughn Harshfield: seems to me the PC is doing just like they did before, making the changes without public approval.

Mangus: I do not want to make a change, even if I agree with it, without discussion from the public.

Dean: You end up with majority acreage owners in a voting minority. Tends to go against the very first goal.

Link: we have other goals, too, rural character. How do we do this?

From audience: HALSTEAD if one person decides to go from RC1 to LDSFR does all of them become LDSFR?

Zakrajsek: All changes that COULD be approved have to go through public hearings for rezoning.

Meyers: Zoning language has to be created and approved.

Link: development is moving this way from Acme.

Dean: people do not want restrictions, it's all about value.

Link: so now we are only focusing on property rights instead of the rest of the goals too. We should keep it in the areas best suited for development.

Zakrajsek: I am not in favor of the 5 acres.

Dean: The majority in the north rules what the people in the south can do.

Link: it makes sense to develop from the "burg" out, where the grounds are better for development.

Meyers: seven members represent the township, taking all these decisions directly to the people would mean nothing would ever get decided.

Dean: we are trying to steer things in a direction we think it should be going.

Mangus: on the future land use map, I do not like the 5 acres but I think we need to contact property owners. Change the names but I do not see a need for rezoning.

Boyd: the public hearing will bring the questions and comments from the public. It is all part of the process. If they want to go for a referendum vote it can be done. There will never be total agreement.

Zakrajsek: the proposal is reducing restriction. If we don't make any change then we are going in the same direction as we were before. We are not making a zoning change, that has a process.

From the audience: Vaughn: this issue is going to come up. The first question I will ask is why are we ignoring question 20?

Boyd: has the attitude of the township changed? We are opening it up for people to be able to make changes if they want.

From audience: Vaughn: people are going to rally on both sides of the issue.

Boyd: if people do not like what we are proposing they will be heard.

From audience: Vaughn: there will be problems with roads if there are large developments allowed.

Boyd: these are all ifs and maybes, let the public speak at public hearing. I like what is proposed and we can let the people come in and make comments. Maybe the people do not care as much as we think they do. Majority rules, even if the majority is not in the areas that are the proposed change areas.

Mangus: which would have more support: the current land use map or the future land use map. I would not in anyway tolerate what this does to my property and I think the majority of my neighbors will oppose it. It is a slightly higher density area. I don't think that is an appropriate place for a store front. I think the 'burg around the post office proposed is insane – mixed use. I think the survey said they do not want the 'burg developed.

Link: people love developed areas, mixed use areas.

Mangus: people love the area because of the nature, it is not industrial, it can be residential

Mangus: we need to ask the people. Our mixed use is very bad.

Meyers: we are working toward the future. Gotta have something that is supportable so we can make changes to what mixed use is currently.

Boyd: public hearing is going to bear this out, yes or no. There is going to be a public hearing, we can have a special public hearing just for this. If we have to work on it some more after the public hearing so be it.

Meyers: we can come out with a future land use map that mirrors the current land use map.

Mangus: motion to head in a direction of our current land use map. Don't see anything that needs to be changed. (no second)

Link: some of the name changes make sense.

Mangus: substantive changes are a problem.

Boyd: Water front property, is it a lake or a creek. The majority of what is presented is good.

Does common sense say water front property is on the water or does a view of the water constitute something different? The terminology is good.

Mangus: Does anyone oppose the name changes? I object to changing the uses.

Dean – Zakrajsek: we are not changing uses.

Mangus: if it is on the map it is step one to making changes. It does not change the zoning, it is step one.

Boyd: we need to move ahead, we need to let the public get this with input. We can have public hearing on the specific issues.

Link: we are going to leave ag

Meyers: Have you decided you do not want LDSFR? We can take out the things you do not want. The majority of the density area is in the MDSFR so it was stretched out down M72.

Link: development is coming. Less restrictive belongs in the 'burg area. We need to protect ourselves and still allow growth.

Meyers: we can make mixed use only on a paved road.

Dean: when I look at the current land use map and this proposed Future Land Use one, this one makes more sense. It is an improvement. I am with the proposed plan.

Boyd: With the zoning that follows this, we may pick up a lot of input at those points. We need to move this forward.

Zakrajsek: I am saying leave them in (RC1) if people want to keep the 5 acres we will hear from them, if we hear from the ones who want to develop we will hear from them too.

Meyers: Limited access areas could be left the same.

Link: I don't think we are going to get the people far south to develop.

Zakrajsek: any further discussion. Go with the proposed one or use the current land use map?

Dean: are we going to discuss the text? YES.

Motion by Dean to accept the future land use map as presented. seconded by Lyons. Roll call vote: Link – no, Boyd – yes, Zakrajsek-no, Mangus – no, Dean – yes, Lyons – yes.

3 to 3, no consensus on map.

Discussion on the text: Part 5

Dean: would like to have a reference to the goals. Future Land Use is in step with the goals.

Link: Do we need a pitch or do we just move right into the planned use categories.

Mangus: leave sentence one, change to potential and then strike everything down to Planned land use categories.

Boyd: add proposed in front of intent

Dean: general question to the attorney so the wording will be in there stating the difference between the ordinance and the future plan.

Mangus: take out briefly and describe the intent

Dean: last sentence of rec/cons – public lands only, not private.

Boyd: Do we have enough property in parks and state owned land. It is just labeling public land as public land.

Link: spot zoning?

Meyers: it holds up. It isn't spot zoning, it is still residential land. Make the state land 40 acre areas. Have not changed the use.

Mangus: mobile home park area that HAS to be in there. Do we have an intent in the law. No one is going to challenge us on it and it is technically legal.

Link: LDSFR, at the end you talk about improved roads. Goals, why we have so much language in here. I think it is more simple than this. Where do we address roads?

Meyers: PUDs and the township board can request road improvement.

Boyd: I don't want to make it more difficult for people to come in. It is unrealistically expensive to trade from the state. Do we want to up-zone like that?

Mangus: when we discussed this previously we did discuss a down zone to lower acreage and an up-zone for the state property.

Dean: is there a notion that we separate it Private, public. Upzone, downzone.

Mangus: is there anything on this map that you don't think we should start working on immediately that we should take out.

Meyers: will discuss with attorney Fahey and will come back for more discussion next week.

Meyers: will not send out a new packet as the next meeting on the 15<sup>th</sup> will be a continuation.

Next meeting: Next Wednesday, February 15, 2012, at 7 p.m.

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