



**ACME TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
ACME TOWNSHIP HALL
6042 Acme Road, Williamsburg MI 49690
7:00 p.m. Monday, September 25, 2006**

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: J. Hull, Zoning Administrator
S. Corpe, Township Manager/Recording Secretary
C. Bzdok, Legal Counsel
J. Iacoangeli, Consulting Planner

1. Consent Calendar:

Motion by David, support by Takayama to approve the Consent Calendar as presented, including:

Receive and File:

- a) **Draft Unapproved Minutes of**
 1. **09/05/06 Regular Board of Trustees Meeting**
 2. **09/11/06 Shoreline Preservation Advisory Meeting**
 3. **09/19/06 Parks & Recreation Advisory Public Forum Meeting**
 4. **County Planning training workshops letter dated 09/18/06**
 5. **Planning & Zoning News August 2006**
- b) **Approve minutes of the 08/28/06 regular Planning Commission meeting**
- c) **Review and approve agenda, inquiry as to conflicts of interest:** approved with no conflicts of interest noted and a change in the heading of section 4 of the meeting from "Public Hearings" to "Preliminary Hearings."

Motion carried unanimously.

2. Correspondence: Four items on the Commission table all relate to Application #2006-11P and can be discussed in conjunction with general discussion about the application.

3. Limited Public Comment: None.

4. Preliminary Hearings:

- a) **Preliminary review of Application #2006-11P, proposed development of 39 single-family site condominium units within Acme Village in the northwest area of the property adjacent to Juniper Hills Condominiums and Crest Haven Hills Subdivision**: Brad Kaye, Gourdie Fraser was present on behalf of Creekside Properties, Inc., a proposed condominium development within the approved Acme Village Mixed Use Development. This represents re-presentation of an application that was brought forward a year or so ago but withdrawn prior to final approval for a variety of reasons.

Mr. Kaye noted that Hull has some concerns over how well the proposed development fits the approved MUD plan, and that he represented Acme Township as a consultant to assist in review of the proposed 2003 amendment to the MUD plan. At that time the Commission recommended and the Board approved amendments to

part, but not all, of the MUD. Dr. Johnson, the Acme Village developer, objected to the decision and litigation followed which was subsequently settled. No MUD amendment SUP document was ever signed, and it is Mr. Kaye's position that signing of such an agreement is not required as a condition of the settlement or the Zoning Ordinance. His applicant considers the 2003 MUD amendment approved according to the conditions imposed by the Board of Trustees.

Mr. Kaye stated that Mr. Hull also had some concerns about the level of detail provided with the current application. Mr. Kaye asserted that the Zoning Ordinance does not require detailed engineered plans for SUP approval; only general site plan level detail. He is seeking that the Commission find that the application is complete and in conformance with the Zoning Ordinance, and that the Commission set a public hearing regarding the application. He was not expecting Bzdok to be present this evening, and requested that he be given an opportunity to respond to anything the township's counsel may have to offer.

Vermetten asked the Commission members if they had any initial questions; they did not.

Hull's chief concern regarding the application is allowable density. He does feel that the proposed MUD amendment SUP was never ratified by one of the parties, Dr. Johnson, and that therefore the offer by the township to grant it lapsed after 1 year as is customary if an SUP is granted but not utilized. The original Acme Village MUD called for 16 housing units and clubhouse, and more than doubling the density raises concerns about the impact of the proposed development on the total project. The overall MUD was approved for a maximum number of housing units, so using more than anticipated in this area for this project could have an impact on the balance of the development later on. He asked Bzdok to be present to provide his counsel on the status of the requested 2003 MUD SUP amendment. Hull stated that he is satisfied that the current level of plan detail is sufficient to move the process forward, leaving only the density issue.

Vermetten asked Bzdok for his opinion as to the status of the 2003 SUP approval. Bzdok has several questions: 1) is the township relying on a statement in a settlement agreement that a particular concept plan is approved that has bearing on the current application and 2) is the township relying on the text of a 2003 SUP document, as no document could be located unsigned or otherwise. He is not aware that this document exists in any form, and feels that this question must be addressed before one can discuss whether or not it has lapsed. Mr. Kaye stated that the Board granted approval in 2003, the matter went to court, and he does not know whether a permit was ever created. His position is that the Board gave approval and only the Zoning Administrator can issue the permit. State statute does not require a signature, nor does he believe the Zoning Ordinance requires it. He feels the township can issue the permit at this time based on the approval and settlement. Bzdok clarified that Mr. Kaye is relying on the Board approval motion and not on the settlement agreement beyond the fact that Dr. Johnson ultimately withdrew his appeal of the Board decision.

Bzdok turned to Hull's density concerns, both as to density of the proposed project relative to the entire concept plan and whether or not it is permissible to use the area previously proposed as parkland to calculate allowable density. Bzdok suggested that the clearest and preferable way to address the situation would be to have Dr. Johnson sign a document now affirming the appropriate amendment to the MUD concept plan. Mr. Kaye concurred, stating the applicant would rely on Hull to provide the

document. Dr. Johnson is out of the country at present so his signature would be delayed, but the proposed SUP document language could be available for the public hearing for review. Mr. Kaye offered the opinion that since his client owns the portion of the Acme Village project under review that his client could agree to an amendment to the MUD SUP relative to this portion of the land. Bzdok disagreed, stating that the MUD SUP permit for the development as an entirety is Dr. Johnson's and not Creekside's, and that Dr. Johnson must agree. Mr. Kaye feels confident that Dr. Johnson would sign, since he sold the property to Creekside knowing what the proposed development plan is. He disagreed with Bzdok's interpretation of authority, feeling that the ability to amend part of the MUD should run with sale of part of the land. Bzdok reiterated his strong recommendation that Dr. Johnson's signature to an MUD SUP amendment be obtained before proceeding much further with the application.

Vermetten asked Hull to expand upon his concerns regarding requested project density, referring to page 2 of the staff report. Hull stated that the question of which MUD concept plan is approved makes all the difference, because the original MUD plan called for 16 residential units and a clubhouse, whereas the 2003 proposed amendment called for 24 units. An increase to 39 units over 16 seems vastly different than an increase to 39 units over 24. He displayed the MUD plan and demonstrated that the proposed project site with 24 proposed units in 2003 was for a larger land area within the development than the area purchased by Creekside. He believes that for this reason, the allowable 24 units on the 2003 MUD plan, if this is the basis, must be prorated down in proportion to the reduction in development land area.

Takayama believes that Bzdok's advice to have Dr. Johnson sign an amendment to the MUD should be taken. This plan seems to differ from what he originally proposed, and the density increase would affect important factors such as impervious surface coverage. Hull reiterated his point that providing additional density in this situation would likely reduce the density available to future developers within the project, and he wants to ensure that this proposed project will not negatively impact the continued development of Acme Village.

Lee Bussa, who often represents Dr. Johnson, was present and Vermetten invited him to comment. He stated that when Creekside purchased the property their purchase agreement specified that the purchasers would need to obtain SUP approval from the township pursuant to the MUD concept plan, although the version was not specified. It was also required that future home purchasers be advised that there would be development across the street from them in the future. Mr. Walton, a principal in Creekside was offered the opportunity to purchase additional land referred to by Hull but declined because Dr. Johnson was seeking a higher price for the property. Originally Mr. Walton proposed 33 residential units and Dr. Johnson was comfortable with this. Mr. Bussa has received e-mail from Dr. Johnson that he is not comfortable with the request for 39 units, precisely for the concerns set forth by Hull. Also, the agreed-upon purchase price was in part based on the proposed number of development units, and had they known Mr. Walton would want more units they would have asked a different price. They have other potential purchasers considering land for residential development on the spur road on the south side of the development, so increasing the density for this proposed development could have a negative impact on buildout of the balance of the MUD. He appreciates and agrees with Bzdok's recommendation to the Commission.

Vermetten read from the 2003 settlement statement a portion that calls for Dr. Johnson and the township to work cooperatively going forward regarding buildout of

the MUD. He feels the Commission should make its deliberations in light of this statement, which means that Dr. Johnson needs to be consulted on how the immediate proposal impacts the overall MUD future development.

Hardin asked what mechanism exists to regulate the number of housing units in the total buildout of the MUD. Bzdok suggested that the township should not look at the situation as adding 5 units in one place and subtracting 5 units in another. The township should address buildout the same way it is addressed for any SUP, and keeping in mind the overall goals of the township regarding density and open space needs. Rather, if a change is to be made in this particular area, will the overall owner of the project area consent; and, will the proposed change meet the township's general SUP approval standards and be in keeping with the Master Plan and the history of decisions regarding the MUD and the community as a whole. The situation must be evaluated within the context of the history of the MUD project to see whether the density amendment is warranted.

Carstens stated that he has not fully evaluated whether or not appropriate stormwater management mechanisms are in place. He asked if the Commission should find that they are before moving the application to the next stage; Hull replied negatively. Carstens agrees that the Master Plan calls for a higher level of housing density in this portion of the township, but wants to ensure that environmental stewardship is addressed within this context. Vermetten noted that Pete Bruski from the Soil Erosion Department has offered his opinion regarding the sedimentation control plan.

Krause asked to what degree Dr. Johnson's feelings regarding the density should be a factor in the Commission's deliberations. Bzdok stated that a public hearing regarding this particular proposed development is also a public hearing regarding proposed amendment of the MUD SUP. In order to craft appropriate public hearing notices for timely publication, the precise nature of the matter under consideration must be understood. Vermetten clarified that the public hearing will be two-pronged: an amendment to the MUD SUP and a new SUP for the particular development. The mathematics of the allowable density is in question. Vermetten also observed Hull's staff report recommendation that the application is not yet complete enough to schedule a public hearing, and asked if this is still Hull's position. It is; Hull believes that the impact of the proposed application on the overall MUD is of significant concern. If the overall MUD needs to be amended due to the impact of the immediate application, the overall MUD SUP amendment process needs be initiated. For this reason he believes this application should remain at the preliminary hearing phase for another month.

Mr. Kaye objects to the advice being given that the original MUD SUP needs to be amended to allow consideration of this application to move forward. It is their position that this step was already taken in 2003. This 2003 amendment was, in his opinion, designed to address transfer of additional density to the subject portion of the development. He believes that it would be most appropriate for the Commission to determine appropriate density after the public hearing, rather than having staff or the applicant make a determination prior to the public hearing. His applicant is willing to work with the township and Dr. Johnson, but not if it requires what they view as duplication of effort already expended.

David asked about the "lifetime" of the prior approvals, noting that it was well more than a year ago. Would the prior approval have been open-ended? Hull confirmed that SUPs expire unless acted upon within a certain time period. The prior Creekside application never received final approval from the Board; the Commission

recommended approval but the applicant pulled the request prior to final approval. Vermetten recalled that it was retracted through a letter to the Township Board.

Wikle stated that this is her first time reviewing or being aware of the application. She believes it must be looked at from today going forward. Dr. Johnson sold the property to the applicant based on a representation of a different project design than the one being put forth today. She also perceives Mr. Kaye as being willing to work with Dr. Johnson and abide by prior actions in some circumstances but not others. She has not yet heard anything indicating to her that any prior approvals were ever granted. It is a new situation and should be addressed on its own merits. Mr. Kaye stated agreement, offering that the Board has approved development of this area of the MUD for single family residences. Regarding the one-year time limitation, he feels that if this is applied to the 2003 MUD SUP amendment it should be applied to the original 1992 MUD SUP amendment as well, throwing the entire project concept plan open to a need for re-approval.

Motion by David, support by Carstens to continue the preliminary hearing regarding Application #2006-11P to the October 30 meeting, at which time the questions discussed this evening will be deliberated.

Hardin asked if the agenda of the October 30 meeting can accommodate the application. He is aware the agenda is substantial and the meeting venue has been changed to a larger space in expectation of a large crowd. Corpe opined that it's up to the Commission, and that to her personally it's good to have many people in attendance to hear deliberations, and that the applicant should not be extraordinarily delayed because there is a significant other issue on the next meeting agenda.

Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

Mr. Kaye asked if anything is required of the application prior to the next meeting. Hull stated that the first step will be obtaining a more in-depth legal opinion. Bzdok believes that an amended application should be brought forward seeking an amendment to the MUD SUP as well as a new SUP for the proposed housing development, and that this will be sufficient for the scheduling of a public hearing. If the applicant refuses, then he will provide a more in-depth opinion as to whether the township should permit the application to proceed without the MUD SUP amendment component. His initial feeling is that it should not, but the matter would deserve thorough investigation.

A recess was declared from 7:59 p.m. - 8:05 p.m.

5. Old Business:

- a) **Continued consideration of proposed Development Options amendment to Zoning Ordinance:** Iacoangeli recalled that there was a special Commission meeting held over the summer to discuss the three proposed development option zoning ordinance amendments, and that the items discussed have been incorporated into a revised draft. The general concept is that while allowable housing density is currently defined by the township as a certain number or type of housing units on a certain size lot within a tract of land, these options would allow the same number of housing units to be developed in a cluster on smaller lots, permitting larger areas of the property to left open and natural. For instance, 40 acres in the agricultural district can currently contain 8 single-family residences each on 5 acre lots. Under the cluster housing option these 8 houses could be clustered on a portion of the property. Additional housing density units could be earned through specific actions such as

placing open spaces under conservation easements. Under the clustered housing option the housing could be detached or semi-detached.

Under the open space development option, single family residences can be developed on smaller lot sizes than would be customary, again leaving the bulk of the land as open space.

The third option is a PUD, available to both residential and commercial land uses. This process has a landowner coming to the township with a master plan similar to the one in place for Acme Village explaining the mix of uses, housing types and densities which is adopted as a master plan for the tract. As uses are developed they are subject to site plan review and must conform to the overall master plan, unless that master plan is amended through a formal amendment review process. A PUD could be entirely residential, entirely commercial, or mixed use. While the first two options are based on the allowable conditions in the underlying zoning, the PUD is not as tied to the density requirements in the underlying zoning of the land and leaves room for flexibility and creativity.

Iacoangeli believes that unless there are additional significant changes to discuss that the matter is ready for public hearing and public input.

Krause believes that if the township wants to encourage innovative land use, the cluster and open space development options must include inherent density bonuses. Otherwise he does not believe landowners will be as willing to consider these options. The bonuses should be tied to particular actions a developer could take. Iacoangeli believes that even without density bonuses, the attractiveness of the options are that development costs for infrastructure are reduced by clustering houses closer together. The amount of pavement or sewer line needed can be drastically reduced, which reduces overall development cost, which in itself is an incentive. As drafted, if the land is within the PDR eligibility district and/or a conservation easement is placed on the open spaces, density bonuses are provided. Krause highly recommends the inclusion of automatic density bonuses tied to specific development decisions for the cluster and open space housing options.

Krause asked if minimum lot sizes are specified; they are for the open space housing but not for the cluster housing. Iacoangeli asked him what he feels an appropriate density bonus should be. The current Open Space Development (OSD) ordinance provides a 20% density bonus for preserving a minimum 50% of the land. This ordinance would be replaced by the proposed new ordinances.

Vermetten observed that the landowner seeking a density bonus could bypass the cluster and open space options and go right to the PUD option. He also observed that a certain size tract of land does not imply that all of the land is usable. A 40-acre tract might have slopes or wetlands that aren't developable if the homes are spread out, effectively reducing the maximum density of the site. By clustering the homesites the maximum units based on the tract size could be obtained whereas by not using the ordinances they could not. There's an automatic incentive to develop otherwise environmentally challenging properties. If more homesites were desired than the zoning would allow, the PUD option could still be pursued.

David asked what the limitations would be on maximum density in the PUD scenario. Iacoangeli replied that to obtain a PUD designation the applicant has to evaluate the site and demonstrate to the township that a significant benefit to the community can be achieved through approval. Some areas, such as those within

sewer and water districts, are appropriate for encouraging higher density, while perhaps other are not.

Krause hopes to see more affordable housing developed within the township, but he believes land costs are too expensive to make this a reality in the residential districts and if it occurs it will be in the agricultural districts. There are ways to create compact 2 and 4 unit dwelling structures. But without bonuses, what's the incentive to do this on an affordable agricultural property? Iacoangeli believes that affordability is influenced by development costs, and allowing a higher number of units per acre does make it more possible to afford to build affordable housing. Krause believes there are a number of communities that provide density bonuses in mixed use developments if a certain number or percentage of residential units are developed as affordable housing, and he would favor such a provision for Acme. Vermetten observed that this can be done through a PUD; Krause was concerned that this option would require more "hoops" to go through than the other two options. Iacoangeli observed that the "affordability index" is a formula based on 80% - 120% of the median salary in a community, so "affordable" varies from community to community. In Spring Lake it is around \$120,000 - \$150,000, but it's higher in Ann Arbor because the average wage is higher. The affordability figure would likely be higher in Grand Traverse County than in Kalkaska County. Iacoangeli also expressed concern over how an affordability inclusion requirement would be managed on an ongoing basis. How do you ensure that an "affordable" unit is purchased by a local worker who needs it as a primary dwelling rather than by someone who is seeking an unusually inexpensive vacation second home.

Takayama believes that the bonus densities should apply more in residential districts than in agricultural districts. The residential districts are already where the township would prefer to have development concentrated. He does not want to encourage development of agricultural parcels for housing, noting that the township does have a purchase of development rights (PDR) program in place but doesn't have enough funding to protect all desirable properties all at once. He believes housing should be concentrated near infrastructure, shopping and other services that would be walkable, but Krause feels that this is not feasible from an economic standpoint. Takayama countered that density bonuses for developing in what would otherwise be a more costly residential area are what would make it possible to develop affordable housing there.

Vermetten agrees that administering an affordable or "workforce" housing program would be difficult, particularly as the math of affordability would be constantly changing. He believes that workforce housing can be contemplated through the PUD option. He asked if the township currently has a minimum home square footage; Hull replied that the minimum dimensions are 24' x 24' or slightly under 600 sq. ft. Krause stated that if his concerns can be addressed through the PUD option he will be satisfied. Iacoangeli stated that affordable housing is a public policy issue that has not been specifically addressed in any of the three options. Hull believes that as a policy matter it might be wise to include it in under at least one option. That way if somebody approaches the township with an application to develop affordable housing, a statement in the ordinance that the township has a policy of encouraging such development could prevent the developer's application being rebuffed because there is no specific policy favoring it. Iacoangeli agreed that inclusion of a policy statement in the PUD option that if the developer provides a certain number of affordable housing units a certain density bonus can be obtained would be great, but the affordability index and bonuses must be clearly defined.

Motion by Carstens, support by Krause to set a public hearing regarding the proposed Development Options Ordinance Amendments for the October 30 meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

- b) **Continued consideration of proposed Business District Revisions amendment to Zoning Ordinance:** Iacoangeli has studied existing permitted uses in the business districts and categorized them by whether they require special use permits. Acme is unusual in his experience because it requires special use permit approval for virtually all permitted uses in the business districts; usually there are permitted uses that require only a land use permit and special uses. He has attempted to recategorize the existing allowable uses into uses by right requiring administrative approval and special uses requiring the public hearing process. He has proposed that retail stores under 60,000 sq. ft. be approved administratively, with larger retail establishments requiring special use permits, which comports with general industry standards for where the break occurs between general retail uses and “big box” uses. Not all types of commercial uses are permitted in all business districts.

Normally he would classify all uses for all districts in a matrix similar to the one he has developed. This makes it easier for someone wanting to start a use in the township to understand where they should be seeking to locate.

As an example he turned to the B-1S, Business Shoreline District. Uses by right would include: accessory uses, interior design studios, neighborhood businesses less than 10,000 sq. ft. gross leasable area, banks, offices, personal services and single family residences. Uses requiring an SUP would include multiple family dwellings, docking facilities, housing over commercial space and hotels and motels. For these latter the township would then have the opportunity to review site design, traffic impact and environmental impact. Carstens asked if any of the proposed uses by right could be sized so as to have a potential significant detrimental impact. Iacoangeli replied that each project is site-specific. Even if an under-10,000 sq. ft. business is a use by right requiring only a land use permit, they still have to meet standards for setbacks, impervious surface coverage, parking, landscaping and such. In his opinion these uses tend to naturally settle at their appropriate size because of the site development conditions that need to be met.

In the B-1P, Professional Office district, permitted uses include: medical offices, professional offices, insurance offices, fine arts studios and the like. A large medical office would have to be on a large property to provide the required level of parking, so size is managed naturally. Hardin noted that there are plenty of office developments are not just individual uses but involve a building with offices and restaurants. It works well, compacting uses and providing people a convenient place to meet multiple needs. He wouldn't mind seeing restaurants permitted by some means in this district and Iacoangeli concurred. Type of restaurant might dictate the permit process required; Iacoangeli recommends that this district allow dine-in restaurants only and not drive-throughs.

In the B-2 district the number of permitted uses is proposed to expand drastically to include entertainment facilities, various types of restaurants, printing facilities and retail establishments under 60,000 sq. ft. Special uses would include automotive-related uses, outdoor cafes and drive-through restaurants and larger retail establishments. Grouped establishments managed as a single property (whether or not owned by a single entity) – planned as a shopping center – would require SUP approval.

In the B-3 district there would be a variety of uses by right that don't exist today. As a real-world example, development of certain tenants for the outlots in Lautner Commons could be approved administratively instead of through a public hearing process. Other uses might require SUP approval.

Overall, the goal is to permit some uses by right rather than making everything an SUP process.

Carstens has been to several sessions about form-based zoning. He feels this could be a very beneficial thing. He wonders if the proposed ordinance amendments would be a good "stop-gap" until form-based zoning could be explored and perhaps adopted for Acme Township. He hopes that if a shopping center is allowed in the township core areas that the ordinances would also allow the inclusion of housing within the development and above the commercial spaces. He finds himself somewhat confused about what the Master Plan says and what we're trying to accomplish. Iacoangeli believes that it would be fine to have upper floor housing options in the B-2 and B-3 districts but that housing shouldn't be on the first floor. If someone wants to propose a mixed use development in a business district including housing styles such as single-family or cottage at ground level, they should apply under the discussed PUD ordinance. He believes it's an option developers will want to use.

Hardin feels the level of concern and discussion over Lautner Commons traffic generation was appropriate. If many of these uses are made uses by right, who watches out for this concern under the new model? Iacoangeli recommended that the developer would be required to identify on the concept site plan the likely number of restaurants in the project. Traffic generation would be studied relative to this projection. The SUP approval would specify what mix of uses is permitted without having to do additional traffic review. Hardin wants to ensure that these matters remain monitored and managed over long-term buildout. Under this model, new outlot development permitted by right pursuant to the projections would be by right, but deviations from the overall plan would review SUP amendment. The situation is similar to that discussed regarding Acme Village earlier in the evening.

Wikle supposed that in the next five years there might be a public transportation system between Kalkaska and Acme. Where might a mass transit station/hub be located and fall in terms of process under the proposed revisions? Iacoangeli would characterize this under the proposed heading of public services requiring an SUP.

Vermetten feels the proposed ordinance is ready to go to public hearing. Carstens feels that we need a transfer of development rights option in our ordinance. The transfer of development rights for the recent Veliquette application was allowed pursuant to the existing OSD ordinance. Iacoangeli stated that a TDR option exists in the proposed PUD ordinance, but not in the cluster or open space options.

Motion by Wikle, support by Yamaguchi to set a public hearing regarding the proposed amendments to the zoning ordinances regarding the business districts for the October 30 meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

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

Bzdok believes the township zoning ordinance works best when we specify what we want. In terms of a PUD ordinance, instead of saying "we will allow flexibility," think about and specify what the goals to be accomplished are and creating categories to address them. Otherwise the township will be constantly surprised and thrown for a loop when applications arise. Perhaps the township wishes to provide for density bonuses in both the agricultural and

residential districts, but with greater bonuses in the residential districts to encourage density there rather than in outlying areas. It's easier on the township and on the community and potential developers.

Andy Andres, Jr. feels that something unique has occurred this evening. The next meeting will include some very broad agenda items (the proposed Future Land Use Map), some medium-breadth issues (the zoning ordinance amendments) and some very specific issues (the Creekside Village development application.) How will the Commission ensure that the public has enough information to be involved? How will the meeting agenda be structured? How will we keep peoples' attention?

Nels Veliquette asked for clarification about density bonuses. If a property is within the PDR eligibility area, it qualifies for a density bonus if 51% is left in active agriculture. He cautions against this type of designation, as the PDR eligibility map carries a specific statement saying that it will not be used for zoning purposes.

Pat Salathiel feels it will be impossible to do full justice to the future land use map and the ordinance amendments at one meeting, and encouraged spreading them out over several meetings, perhaps giving a brief overview of future issues at the next meeting to encourage people to come back for them.

Jay Zollinger was shocked to learn that the township allows housing as small as 24' x 24' and feels we should look at a larger minimum size that is still affordable. Otherwise, if it's too small it might attract elements that won't keep it up well. He feels a square footage designation rather than dimensions would be more useful. Hull has learned that the ordinance is written the way it is now as means to exclude single-wide trailers.

Ken Engle believes we need to think about how to get housing density into the residential districts and out of the agricultural districts. We already have some new mechanisms in place. He does not think enough thought and creativity has been used yet to accomplish this goal. Even if the current agricultural district ultimately becomes large lot residential development there is land use character to be considered. To say that the agricultural district is the only place to put affordable housing isn't acceptable. He can't afford to farm with affordable housing next to him.

Mr. Andres stated that there was discussion about density bonuses if agriculturally zoned land remains in agricultural production. What if a family wants to cease farming and let the land revert to a natural state? We shouldn't force a family to keep farming if they don't want to. As to affordable housing, there is a recognizable cycle of homeownership. People start with smaller, less expensive homes and tend to trade up over time. Associations are important – having a neighborhood association helps to keep people in less expensive housing from letting it run down and creating blighted neighborhoods.

Carstens feels Ms. Salathiel's comments deserve discussion, and that these important issues are too important to tackle all in one evening. Wikle expressed openness to a change to the date of the public hearing she proposed. Corpe suggested that the ordinance amendments be moved to the December meeting, allowing a few months to begin future land use map discussions before moving to more detailed discussions.

Motion by Wikle, support by Carstens to move the public hearings for the development option and business district ordinance zoning amendments to the December meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 9:23 p.m.