



**ACME TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
ACME TOWNSHIP HALL
7:00 p.m. Monday, April 23, 2007
6042 Acme Road, Williamsburg, Michigan 49690**

Meeting called to Order with the Pledge of Allegiance at 7:00 p.m.

Members present: M. Vermetten (Chair), B. Carstens, C. David, R. Hardin, D. Krause, E. Takayama, L. Wikle, P. Yamaguchi

Members excused: J. Pulcipher

Staff Present: S. Corpe, Township Manager
J. Hull, Zoning Administrator

1. Consent Calendar:

Motion by Wikle, support by Yamaguchi to approve the Consent Calendar as presented, including:

Receive and File:

- a) Draft Unapproved Minutes of:
 - 1. **04/10/07 Regular** Board of Trustees Meeting
 - 2. **04/05/07 YCNA** Meeting
 - 3. **04/16/07 Farmland Preservation** Advisory Meeting

Action:

- b) Approve minutes of the **03/26/07 regular** Commission meeting.
- c) Review and approve agenda, inquiry as to conflicts of interest:

Motion carried unanimously.

2. Correspondence: None

3. Limited Public Comment: None

4. Special Presentations: None

5. Preliminary Hearings: None

6. Public Hearings:

- a) **Continued hearing regarding SUP/Site Plan Application #2007-01P, a cheese factory for Bart Nielsen at 9018 US Highway 31 North:** Hull's staff memo indicates that the applicant is not yet ready to proceed and has asked for a continuation to the May meeting.

Motion by Takayama, support by David to continue the public hearing regarding Application #2007-01P to the May meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

7. New Business:

- a) **Discuss comments regarding Grand Traverse County Comprehensive Plan:** Hull reported that the Planning Commission is one party that reviews proposed County comprehensive plan. The township's review should specifically address how the proposed County plan meshes with the township's Master Plan. Hull provided a checklist for plan amendment review which the Commission talked through.

Carstens thought he read of the possibility of an amendment to the County Farmland

Preservation Ordinance, and is concerned that any such revisions will have an impact on Acme and its Farmland Preservation Ordinance and plan.

Wikle asked about the mention of establishing a Metropolitan Planning Organization. Carstens reported that this is specifically a transportation-related body that can be formed if the region has a high enough population/population density. If the necessary population levels are established in the 2010 Census, the area will qualify for additional funding. The goal is to move TC-TALUS towards the full form and function of an MPO.

David feels that the County's proposed comprehensive plan may conflict with Acme's Master Plan in that our local plan calls for commercial development that meets the needs of township residents and the County plan seems to him to have a general tone of encouraging commercial development more globally. His concern was related to the statement on page 17 labeled I.1. Vermetten and Krause felt less concern than David, feeling that the end of the statement tying new business growth and diversification to population expansion was proportional. There was a feeling that the word "and" third from the end of the statement should be "an." David would have liked to see more direct recognition in the County's proposed plan that people come to the Grand Traverse Region to escape fast-paced growth. It was determined that there would be no comment to checklist item 3A.

Takayama noted that on page 7 of the County Plan there is a goal to develop a watershed overlay ordinance with East Bay, Garfield and Blair Townships. He wondered why Acme was not included. Carstens speculated that the Acme and Yuba Creek watersheds are peripheral in the county and not directly connected to the Boardman and Mitchell Creek watersheds that run through all of the mentioned jurisdictions. Takayama feels the County plan discusses rural and wetlands preservation but does not discuss shoreline preservation adequately. Hull noted that the discussion on page 3 indicates that shoreline preservation was not one of the top five priorities suggested by a survey of County residents. Krause countered that a local Acme survey indicated that shoreline preservation was a top priority, and suggested we point this out to the County.

Yamaguchi feels the County Plan is quite consistent with Acme's Master Plan. Wikle agreed. Carstens noted that the A.2. goal statement mentions a commitment to preserve natural resources including shoreline preservation. Vermetten believes there are no inconsistencies to note in the response to checklist question 5A. Hardin and David feel that the question is addressed in the County plan and could be strengthened, but neither felt the issue was of sufficient concern to comment.

In general the County proposed comprehensive plan was found to be generally consistent with Acme Township's Master Plan. Carstens feels that there are "at least 11" areas in the County plan that are not addressed in the township plan which he feels should be addressed in the future. Vermetten encouraged keeping this plan at hand as a reference resource.

8 Old Business:

Corpe reported that Acme Township has been awarded a \$5,000 Program Grant by Rotary Charities to prepare a master plan for what to do with our shoreline if and when we acquire it publicly. The Board has approved a contract with Russ Clark and has indicated that the Planning Commission will manage the project. It should appear on the agenda in May and/or June.

9. Public Comment/Any other business that may come before the Commission:

Nels Veliquette spoke to the proposed transfer of development rights provisions in the proposed new zoning ordinances under consideration. He does not think that it should be possible to transfer development rights into the agricultural zone from outside of it, but he does believe it should be possible to transfer development rights within the agricultural zone to facilitate preservation of larger tracts of land in active agriculture. Vermetten asked about the status of the ordinance; after final revisions it will be headed to County review in May and could be on the Board agenda in June.

David asked for an update regarding the lawsuit between the Johnson Family Limited Partnership and the owners of the cell tower erected in Acme Village. Hull and Corpe are aware that there have been depositions, oral arguments and settlement discussions, but are unaware of the status beyond that.

Hull reported that, regarding requests for tribes to place land in trust status, there is a relatively new rule in effect that requires Tribe's to provide some indication of what the land use might be. The statement can be quite broad, and can have the effect more of stating what it will not be used for (gaming) than what it will be used for. An application for trust status is truly simply to place the land in federal hands rather than to specify any particular use.

Meeting adjourned at 7:46 p.m.