



ACME TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Acme Township Hall
6042 Acme Road, Williamsburg, Michigan
7:00 p.m. Monday, November 26, 2007

Meeting called to Order with the Pledge of Allegiance at 7:02 p.m.

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

Members excused: None

Staff Present: S. Vreeland, Township Manager/Recording Secretary
J. Hull, Zoning Administrator
M. Grant, Legal Counsel
J. Iacoangeli, Planning Consultant

INQUIRY AS TO CONFLICT OF INTEREST: None noted.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA: Motion by Carstens, support by White to approve the agenda as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

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. 10/23/07 Special Board meeting
 2. 11/13/07 Board meeting
 3. Foster, Swift, Collins & Smith, PC Township Law Newsletter, October 2007

Action:

- b) 1. Approve minutes of the 10/29/07 regular Commission meeting

Motion carried unanimously.

2. Correspondence: An e-mail was received this evening that relates to the Bates Crossings project.

3. Limited Public Comment:

Noelle Knopf, 5795 US 31 N stated that the Court of Appeals made a ruling in one of the lawsuits affecting the township, and the township has filed for leave to appeal with the Supreme Court. She asked if the Planning Commission has scheduled Phase I of the Village at Grand Traverse (VGT) for SUP review and if not how it could be scheduled; Vermetten stated that there are no plans to do so at this time.

Andy Andres, Jr., Traverse City, asked if there is any news regarding the cell tower in Acme Village; there is not.

Hull and Grant observed that the Planning Commission previously tabled review of Phase I of the VGT until all lawsuits relating to it have been resolved.

4. Preliminary Hearings:

- a) **Request from Northland Contractors for a Major Amendment to the car wash**

Special use Permit #95-6P to add an oil-change service to 4200 M-72 East: Ken Ockert, R. Clark Associates, provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding the application. There is an existing car wash between a private residence and the Williamsburg Dinner Theater on the south side of M-72 on property currently zoned B-2, General Business. The owner is seeking a major amendment to the existing SUP to add an oil change facility to the site. The existing building would be expanded northward 21' to the require property front-yard setback. The additional area and one existing car wash stall would become the oil change facility. Additional landscaping along M-72 would be required to meet ordinance requirements. The Drain Commissioner's office has stated that because no additional impervious surface will be created, no site drainage plan amendments are required. The applicant will talk to MDOT about whether the additional use would pose any access concerns or modifications, as well as with the DPW about water use issues and Metro Fire about fire prevention.

Krause would prefer to have native species used in the landscaping, and asked that locust trees proposed be replaced by one of two native oak species. David asked how waste product from the oil change business would be handled. Mr. Ockert stated that the applicant owns several oil change facilities already and is well-versed with how to handle the waste product. Vermetten believes that an MDEQ permit is required. Carstens further sought and received affirmation that the DEQ would monitor the business on an ongoing and regular basis to ensure that no toxic fluids enter the watershed. Mr. Ockert stated that the architectural drawings they are working with will have to be approved not only by the local building code office but also by the DEQ.

Yamaguchi sees mention from 1995 proceedings of a service drive and asked if it had been installed; it has and serves a building to the south of the car wash.

Vreeland informed Mr. Ockert that there had been a dispute between the individual who owned the car wash three owners ago and the owner of the residence immediately to the west. In part it involved erection of a screening fence between the two land uses, which the township did require.

Carstens asked how he may be able to access literature or research about environmental contamination problems that may result from oil change businesses. He is aware of several different sorts of businesses in town that have had this problem. Mr. Ockert suggested contacting the DEQ.

Motion by Krause, support by David to set a public hearing for the SUP amendment application for the December meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

5. Public Hearings:

- a) **Continuation of Public hearing on SUP/Site Plan Application #2007-05P, a planned shopping center located on E M-72 west of Bates Road:** Doug Mansfield presented the application. Over the past month he has been addressing issues relating to fire protection and the Drain Commission/Soil Erosion. The latter had requested some changes to the proposed rain garden water dispersal system resulting in larger drainage basins. Metro Fire has expressed concern that loading areas not impact the ability for emergency services to access all sides of the building. An emergency access area will be widened by 8'. He also received a letter from TART about connection to the local trail system.

Iacoangeli is in the final state of preparing a full site plan review, and has provided a

preliminary report to the Commission listing items for the applicant to address. They are having the traffic study information reviewed and having Grobbel Associates review some environmental aspects of the site. He finds the market assessment insufficient after having it reviewed by a marketing firm he works with, stating that the information is very generalized in nature and available to anyone over the Internet. It does not rise to the level of detail provided by Anderson Economic Group for the VGT and/or Lautner Commons. The three projects combined would provide way more retail space than the original Anderson Economic Group (AEG) report felt could be supported by the area. Many of the items on the checklist deal with parking or landscaping. Iacoangeli has also noted that significant amounts of soil are scheduled to be removed from the site. The e-mail received today relative to the application came from MDOT and indicates that it will not be possible to realign the Bates Road/M-72 intersection because of the current railway usage there, which impacts the way in which the site will be accessed. Additionally, the question of whether or not the site will be served by the regional sewer system has not been resolved, and if it will not then plans for an on-site sanitary system approved by various agencies will be needed. Iacoangeli plans to provide a complete package with agency letters for the December meeting.

Hardin asked about the notation on the summary that perhaps the stores are not grouped sufficiently to meet the ordinance requirements. How is the required grouping defined, or how should it be? Hull stated that the township has not had the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) provide an interpretation. During the Lautner Commons application there was discussion were not grouped, being spread out over the site. The Commission eventually deemed the layout acceptable, and staff did not feel the situation merited further ZBA interpretation.

Public Hearing opened at 7:31 p.m.

Mr. Andres, Jr. quoted from the Acme Township Master Plan, page 73, stating that a neighborhood center plan for the Bates area should be jointly developed by the township and the area landowners. On page 80 the Master Plan encourages new development that fits in with existing development and provides a basis for future design. He hopes the Commission will be mindful of these passages as they continue to review the application.

Public Hearing closed at 7:32 p.m.

Carstens believes that the public hearing should continue through the subsequent meeting so the public can respond to the information forthcoming from the township's consultant. Vermetten concurred.

David expressed the thought that the traffic and/or market studies as currently in hand may be amended during the remainder of the process. Iacoangeli agreed, and noted that the VGT, Lautner Commons and Bates Crossings project must be considered with respect to their relationship to one another and the community at large. It is important to have a market assessment that considers not only the subject project but the other two projects as well. The three combined would provide over 1,000,000 sq. ft. of retail space; a vast amount for a community this size. He believes the applicant should bring in a market assessment firm such as AEG to be able to answer the detailed questions. Vermetten stated early on, and reiterated this evening, his belief that the three projects should be considered independently, without assuming that any or all will be built. Perhaps the owners of one or both of the other properties might not ultimately build. He also believes that it is the applicant's right to assume the risk of overbuilding. He also does not have a clear definition of what would be a "sufficient" market study. Iacoangeli stated that the market study information provided is very generalized – of the sort provided by a firm

called Claritas that would give a retailer an idea of where they might consider locating a new store. Vermetten questioned where in the ordinance anything more detailed is required. Hull read from Section 8.12.1(1), stating that the purpose of the market analysis requirement is to “protect the township from over-development of retail sales and service establishments which could prove highly injurious to the community welfare.” David appreciated elements of both sides of the debate. Carstens appreciated Hull’s citation and believes that the market study should be “meaningful.” He does not believe that VGT or Meijer, Inc. have spent the time and effort they have to maintain their properties vacant. David asked Carstens if he believes the Commission has sufficient information to review the application at hand on its own merits and without reference to other proposed developments. Carstens noted that the project should comport with the ordinance and the township Master Plan, but he lacks a complete understanding of how much weight the latter should have. Certain sections of the ordinance allow the Commission discretion in the decision-making process. He has not entirely made up his mind whether or not the existing information is sufficient.

Carstens noted that the Lautner Commons project was not approved until the question of appropriate road improvements for traffic flow and safety was resolved. The Bates/M-72 intersection is already problematic, particularly since the horse sports facility on North Bates opened earlier this year. The traffic safety questions relative to this site have yet to be resolved.

Wikle views Iacoangeli’s summary as a list of items to be considered. She is not comfortable that all the details have yet been provided that would allow her to make a decision about the project.

Vermetten would like the Commission to provide additional detailed feedback to the applicant about the bullet points on the list and what we need to receive to facilitate a decision.

Yamaguchi appreciates the concerns raised by Carstens about various details such as traffic safety. She is always mindful of the big picture and does not feel ready to address them until more of the details are known.

White also stressed the safety and function of the Bates/M-72 intersection. He expressed concern about the first item on the Iacoangeli list: an assertion that the proposed use of the property does not meet the objectives of the Master Plan. He asked if the property is zoned for the proposed use. Hull replied that it is zoned for a shopping center, but state law also says that when a land use is allowable by special use, as this one is, the township should ensure that the use is designed in a way that is consistent with the Master Plan. White expressed disbelief that the use could be allowed by zoning but inconsistent with township planning documents. David understood the concept that it would not be practical or desirable for every property zoned a certain way in the township to be used identically. Grant noted that in most zoning districts there are both uses by right and uses by special use permit. SUP uses are subject to a set of development standards before they can be approved. Vermetten concurred. White believes that the applicant is meeting the development standards, and that studies of questionable value about anything can be obtained from anyone. He has a hard time believing that the standards of the Master Plan are not being met.

Krause feels that some of the discussion is premature. The first time he has seen the summary is this evening. He is expecting further documentation about these points from Iacoangeli at the next meeting, and that discussion should wait until those arguments are received. Krause believes a market study should be done and that it should contain proof

of why the results are as presented. Iacoangeli stated an understanding that the applicant and the township were seeking some preliminary indications of issues that might need to be addressed, which is what was prepared for this evening. A detailed report similar to that provided for Lautner Commons will be provided and can be discussed at that time. Vermetten agreed that the summary list was prepared to provide feedback requested by the applicant and that detailed discussion is premature. Hardin concurred as well.

Vermetten invited Mr. Mansfield to comment/ask questions. Mr. Mansfield is looking forward to discussion with Iacoangeli. He stated that the applicant, through the township Escrow Policy, has signed on to a review process with no budget or scope of services. He is uncertain where things are heading, but knows he is footing the bill. He looks forward to direct discussion with Iacoangeli on site plan issues. He is comfortable with having the URS traffic study reviewed by another party. The discussion about the market study this evening recalls a question he asked from the outset of what the market study should contain. He also asked why the township is not asking whether a new oil change facility is needed when another is a short way down the road, or why the township doesn't ask whether or not more houses are needed before a new subdivision is considered. He stated that Acme is the only township in the county that requires a market study for a planned shopping center SUP. He understands that the Infrastructure Advisory is still working on the question of whether or not the sewer district should be expanded, having recently received an update from Vreeland. He hopes he will be given an opportunity to help find the answers to our questions, and feels that as former BPW Chairman he can be very helpful in this regard. Mr. Mansfield says that he spoke with the DPW today and they seem to wonder why we wouldn't want to allow his project to access the relief sewer line installed along the bayfront.

Mr. Mansfield believes that the requirement for a public hearing has been satisfied and would like to see that aspect of the process formally closed at this time.

Hull stated that before the township adopted the Escrow Policy, the "black hole" of potential review costs was borne by the taxpaying public. The policy shifted that responsibility to the applicant. The standard and scope of review has not changed. Hull stated that a meaningful market study shouldn't be difficult to create, although in his experience they are rarely obtained. He summarized the e-mail from MDOT this evening, which Vreeland provided to Mr. Mansfield and which indicates Generations Management staff were involved in the discussion.

Grant feels that justification for an enhanced market study can be found in the zoning ordinance if the Commission accepts the consultants feeling that it is warranted.

David recalled Mr. Mansfield's statement that Acme is the only township that requires a market study, and wondered why the oil change facility would not require one. He believes that the scope of a shopping center is entirely different than that of one additional oil change bay. Part of the difference is the area from which potential traffic will be drawn. Retail traffic from a 50 mile radius will have an impact on the community.

Vermetten asked if the Commission can close the public hearing. Grant feels it should be left open, particularly if there is a feeling that the elements of the application are incomplete.

Motion by Carstens, support by Yamaguchi to continue the public hearing on application #2007-05P. Motion carried unanimously.

b) Application by Immanuel LLC. to rezone from R-1MH (mobile home

park/subdivision) to R-3 residential approx. 92 acres south of M-72 near Bates Road. The land is the southern half of the parcel on which the Bates Crossing application is in review: Mr. Mansfield presented the application. He stated that the property was rezoned to R-1MH 12 years ago. He believes that the allowable housing densities would be similar under either zoning designation. The current designation does not allow for any real flexibility in development design, which for mobile home parks is heavily state-regulated. The site has significant changes in elevation of over 150', and the change in zoning designation would allow for creativity in housing development design that could better work with and respect the natural features there. The site has mixed hardwood and pine vegetation. They would like to develop a water tower to serve the project and perhaps other properties, and hope to have it included in the township sewer district.

Hull directed the Commission's attention to a memo from Grant that set forth six questions relative to the appropriateness of a rezoning request. He also noted previous discussion about the fact that unless the township takes additional action, rezoning this property could result in a loss of control by the township over where mobile home parks may be sited. He also noted that he tried to look up the incorporation information for Immanuel LLC on a state website, but found the information complicated by multiple changes in corporate names. Ultimately they lead back to Generations Management and Nielsen Enterprises, and he finds it interesting that this same entity requested the original rezoning to R-1MH.

Carstens asked if B-4 zoning is taxed at a higher rate than R-1MH. Vreeland replied that all properties are taxed at the same rate. Carstens wondered if a parcel with one zoning has an inherently different value than one with different zoning; Vreeland suspects not and that the value of land for any given purpose is variable over time and depending on circumstances.

Public Hearing opened at 8:17 p.m.

Tim Lederer, 8300 Bennett Road asked where the property sits in relation to the lumber business. The new table tennis facility is just south of the access point from the property to Bates Road.

Jay Zollinger, 4323 Williamston Court asked for clarification on the idea that if this property is rezoned the township might be required to allow mobile home parks in other areas. Grant stated that the state requires that a township provide the ability for a land use to locate within it if a demonstrated need exists. Court decisions have held that townships may not exclude mobile homes simply because they are seen as undesirable. If there is nowhere in the township zoned to allow a mobile home park and an applicant could demonstrate a need, it's possible for a court order to be obtained allowing a mobile home park on any suitable property anywhere in the township.

Mr. Andres, Jr. likes the idea of allowing additional creativity in site development for the property. Would it be possible to accomplish this by rezoning only part of the property, or through a different mechanism entirely?

Pat Salathiel, 4888 Five Mile Road asked the Commission to think very carefully about any potential rezoning request in this area. Her very first Commission meeting contained a request to rezone a piece of property for a particular use which was well thought of. After the rezoning was approved the property was put up for sale, open to any use allowed by the new zoning designation.

Mr. Andres, Jr. asked if Mr. Iacoangeli is addressing both applications for Immanuel LLC; he is not.

Public Comment closed at 8:22 p.m.

Hardin asked Hull about the other property zoned R-1MH. That land is state-owned and unlikely to ever be developed or be seen as a viable alternative for mobile home development. Hardin asked if perhaps the zoning for that parcel should be changed to more accurately reflect what might happen with it; Hull suspects that there's little utility in expending the time and effort to change the zoning when it's unlikely to matter. Mr. Mansfield noted that his township is 72% state land. State land swaps happen all the time, so it would be silly to assume that it will always remain state land.

David asked if the project is dependent upon public sewer; Mr. Mansfield said it is not necessarily so, there being "two other options." Carstens asked if there is water or wetlands on the site; Mr. Mansfield said there are not. Yamaguchi feels strongly that the township needs an area zoned for mobile home park use. Vermetten observed that Nielsen Enterprises felt in 1995 the property should be rezoned for a mobile home park, but so far nobody has seen fit to develop one there. He also feels that the points in Grant's memo should be very closely scrutinized.

David asked if the township has received interest in developing a mobile home park. Hull said that there has been at least one party interested in locating a mobile home park here; they felt this particular site was not well suited topographically to such a use. Hardin asked if Whitewater Township has an area designated for mobile home parks, and if they did would it mean that Acme would not have to provide one? Vermetten says there is such a zoning designation in Whitewater Township. Grant stated it might or might not be interpreted that this is sufficient for the surrounding area. Hardin lived in a trailer park himself once and wouldn't care to repeat the experience, but he is aware of pleasant ones such as Kings Court. Carstens feels that the decision must be based in some part on whether or not space for mobile home parks is needed.

Yamaguchi noted the minutes from the 1995 rezoning from B-4 to R-1MH and discussion about potential "upscale" development and "affordable housing" at different points during the conversation. The planner at that time stated that headwaters for Yuba Creek occurred on this parcel; Carstens observed that this is a reference to the northern part of the parcel that is zoned B-3. Vermetten feels they meant an upscale mobile home park such as Kings Court.

Vermetten feels we don't have an answer as to whether mobile home park zoning in surrounding township would "cover" Acme. Grant stated that the presence of mobile home parks nearby might demonstrate that a need is being met, but perhaps not definitively.

Motion by Krause, support by David to recommend approval of the rezoning application from R-1MH to R-3 to the Board of Trustees.

Hull suggested that discussion include findings of fact relative to the six evaluation points provided by Grant. Krause did not feel this is required. Grant stated that technically this is true, but the Commission is charged with making a recommendation to the Board regarding the rezoning, and the Board would certainly appreciate an understanding of the reasoning behind the recommendation.

Krause believes that the topography of the site lends itself to a more creative site plan

than R-1MH would permit. The Zoning Administrator has indicated that a mobile home park developer considered this site and found it unsuitable. David agrees with Krause that R-3 is a more reasonable designation, but he has concerns over handling traffic and sanitary waste. Wikle stated that she has not been persuaded that the current zoning designation is faulty and should be changed. Yamaguchi asked if other allowable uses exist for the R-1MH designation; the only allowable uses are varieties of mobile home parks. Carstens feels that the site is large enough that different portions could be developed as mobile home parks in different ways. He needs more information about the need for mobile home parks before changing the zoning.

Motion carried by a vote of 5 in favor (David, Hardin, Krause, Vermetten, White) and 3 opposed (Carstens, Yamaguchi, Wikle.)

A brief recess was called by the chair from 8:43 p.m. to 8:49 p.m.

Mr. Mansfield stated that he has spoken with Mark Lewis and he has taken on a large task with the Infrastructure Advisory. If he cannot devote the time to finding the answers along with his regular employment, Mr. Mansfield would be glad to assist in gathering data for review.

- c) **Application by LochenHeath Land Co. for a Major Amendment to Open-Space Development special-use permit to reconfigure the project Master Plan, to include some duplex housing; located at 4455 Heath Drive, Acme Township, U.S. 31 North, north of Dock Road:** Ken Ockert presented the application. Brian Rowley and Troy Molby from Gourdie Fraser and Guy Guarino from LochenHeath were also present. A PowerPoint presentation slightly revised from the first showing several months ago was provided. The amendment to the existing LochenHeath OSD general plan would use some allowable density not previously sited to be distributed within the plan, and for some units planned a single-family cottages in the created lake area to become duplexed units. 215 single family units would be reduced to 130, cottages would increase from 83 to 118, duplexes would go from zero to 74 structures containing 148 units. Total density would change from 409 units to 407 units. Some of the land area currently within LochenHeath would be swapped with lands adjacent to it under different ownership, changing the shape of the LochenHeath community fairly moderately. Building envelopes have been created on the single family lots to control precise placement of the lots, and three different building plans/footprints ranging from 2,700 to 4,200 sq. ft. will be available. 56.1% of the site would remain in open space, meeting minimum 50% OSD open space requirements. Lots, road rights-of-way, golf holes and maintenance facilities are counted as development space.

Mr. Rowley stated that needed approvals from the Drain Commission have been obtained. Water runoff is being stored in the lakes area at a 100-year storm capacity when a 25-year storm capacity is required and released through the chain of lakes. An agreement has been reached for water to be provided by the Grand Traverse Band. Mr. Rowley stated that sewer lines are under construction and planned to be connected to the regional sanitary system and turned over to the township upon completion. Lake levels may fluctuate up to a foot based on irrigation or rain events. A well system will keep the lakes at a minimum level regardless of natural conditions. Hardin asked if this is the well system that concerned Deepwater Point residents as far as whether or not heavy draws would impact their water availability. Mr. Rowley stated that when the water for home use in the project was proposed to be from on-site wells, additional irrigation wells would be required. Now that the Tribal water system will serve LochenHeath, the existing home-use wells are planned to be converted for irrigation and lake maintenance use. The flow rates on those existing wells is restricted.

Krause expressed disappointment with the way the amendment has been designed. He feels the water features are being reduced and roads and housing units increased. The next time he fears that all of the water will be gone. Instead of a nice lake in the western area he sees “two potholes.”

Yamaguchi asked about drainage, which the applicant says will utilize existing County drainage easements. She asked who will maintain these drains; Mr. Rowley replied that the county does. LochenHeath is required to maintain storage for a 25-year storm event on-site, releasing it slowly in to the municipal drainage system. Yamaguchi stated that the drainage system is in bad shape right now. Mr. Rowley stated that LochenHeath has asked the County to maintain the existing drainage system, or even enhance it. He noted that sometimes when private landowners install or replace a culvert they don't use the appropriate size. Yamaguchi is concerned that homes on Deepwater Point Road will be flooded out, but Mr. Rowley contends that the water released will be better controlled and managed as it leaves LochenHeath than it is today.

Mr. Ockert displayed a revised phasing plan for the full LochenHeath OSD as the conclusion of the presentation.

Wikle noted a proposed road connection to Dock Road, but says the township had been told in the past that there would be none. The connection is a gated emergency services access that has been on the plans all along.

Public Hearing opened and closed at 9:11 p.m., there being no public comment.

David asked Hull about the formula for calculating open space in an OSD and whether LochenHeath satisfies the requirements in the ordinance. Hull has not explored this in detail. The amount of water has decreased from the original plans, so if anything the allowable density might increase. Vreeland believes that the amount of water on a site pre-development impacts the allowable development density, but is uncertain that a created water feature would have an effect.

Vermetten echoed Krause's feelings that the decrease in the size of the water features has been a detriment to the overall plan.

Motion by David, support by Carstens to recommend approval of the major amendment to the LochenHeath Open Space Development to the Board of Trustees. Motion carried by a vote of 7 in favor (Carstens, David, Hardin, Vermetten, White, Wikle, Yamaguchi) and 1 opposed (Krause.)

6. New Business:

a) Discussion of M-72 Corridor. Supporting documentation provided includes:

- **[Cover memo from S. Vreeland](#)**
- **[Proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment #127](#)**
- **[Excerpt – 10/05/04 Board of Trustees Minutes](#) (rejecting ordinance)**
- **[M-72 Corridor Access Management Plan](#) (MDOT)**
- **[M-72 Corridor Study](#) (R. Clark)**

Vreeland summarized her memo regarding the history of the M-72 corridor planning initiative. Vermetten wondered aloud why Acme and Whitewater have met with so much difficulty in passing an ordinance. Vreeland believes that the answer lies in the combination of things the ordinances have tried to address. The last draft to fail included not only access management items, but landscaping and architectural

standards. Landowner concerns seemed to her to center on the extent and likely expense of meeting the aesthetic standards, and the amount of land it might take to accomplish it. It might be well to start by working through the list of ordinance elements and finding out which ones might be generally well-received in principle and which are more problematic for landowners. Perhaps some should be addressed at this time and some deferred.

Yamaguchi appreciated Vreeland's memo, feeling that the last paragraph on page 2 is particularly important. She believes that a joint effort between township officials and corridor landowners would be beneficial, and that a joint effort with Whitewater Township should also be encouraged.

Krause noted that there are decisions about M-72 that MDOT will make that we cannot impact, such as traffic light placement. It is their road and they have their rules for it that perhaps we cannot change. We can try to keep it aesthetically pleasing. Vreeland and Hull agreed that this is true, but that clearly we can have an impact. Acme and Whitewater Townships prevented the originally-proposed repaving project from happening and all these years later all parties are meeting on a regular basis about corridor issues. We can work together to have a positive impact.

Mr. Andres, Jr. thanked the township for exploring the issue. He nearly lost his life at the Lautner Road/M-72 Intersection. He is planning to do some sketching of ideas for the M-72 corridor and make himself and his ideas available for discussion. Perhaps seeing the situation visually through some sketching will clarify issues and enhance communication. His phone number is 932-0063, and his e-mail address is a.andres@charter.net. He encouraged people to contact him for some additional discussion and planning.

Hardin feels that much of the complaints that might be raised deal with eminent domain issues. He once lived in a house that extended into a road right-of-way and couldn't be moved due to power line locations. Some houses that still exist along the corridor would be wiped out by road widening, and the potential to lose one's house for uncertain compensation is frightening. We need to make it clear that we are not encouraging such situations to occur.

Carstens feels that the work on the corridor that Pat Salathiel, Russ Clark and Dave Krause did was visionary and expressed his thanks.

Vermetten encouraged the Commission to keep this issue at the forefront of their minds. He'd like it to be on the agenda in the upcoming months, and to contact landowners, citizens, planners and representatives from Whitewater Township and the Tribe to see if they would like to work together on the issue. He would be looking to make a recommendation to the Board for formation of an advisory group within the next few months. Carstens noted the ongoing Grand Vision effort that will address our transportation corridors.

7. Old Business:

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

Judith Danford Tank, Whitewater Township, writes for the *Elk Rapids News*. She offered the newspaper's services as the project progresses. A lot of existing information needs to be evaluated before further work begins. She believes that the current Whitewater Planning Commission Chair would be interested, as would former Commissioners Jim Lagowski and

Joe Anderson. She believes the project is important and would be glad to attend meetings and help write public information materials. She and her husband almost died in an accident near Barker Creek several years ago and they appreciate the need for additional safety measures on M-72.

Mr. Andres, Jr. noted a comment regarding Bates Crossings as to what role the Master Plan plays in evaluating the application. The Master Plan has been given much weight regarding the VGT and Lautner Commons projects, and should be given much weight as to Bates Crossings too. Along with considering those projects, thought should be given to Acme Village and Tribal plans as well. Regarding the oil change business there are many questions to be answered, but he expects they will be addressed at the public hearing level where detailed discussions generally occur.

Vreeland noted that the December meeting will be two weeks earlier than usual, on December 17, due to the holidays.

Meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.