



**ACME TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**Acme Township Hall**  
**6042 Acme Road, Williamsburg, Michigan**  
**7:00 p.m. Monday, October 26, 2009**

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

**Members present:** M. Vermetten (Chair), B. Carstens (Vice Chair), C. David, S. Feringa, R. Hardin, D. White, P. Yamaguchi, J. Zollinger

**Members excused:** D. Krause

**Staff Present:** J. Hull, Zoning Administrator

**INQUIRY AS TO CONFLICTS OF INTEREST:** None noted.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA:** Motion by Yamaguchi, support by David to approve the agenda as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

**1. Consent Calendar:**

Carstens asked for clarification of 09-28-09 Planning Commission minutes: page 4 of 7, third paragraph "Zollinger feels that regulations for shadow flicker mitigation should be compulsory rather than compulsory." Zollinger said that he meant they should be "voluntary rather than compulsory."

**Motion by David, support by Yamaguchi to approve the Consent Calendar with correction, including:**

**Receive and File:**

**a) Draft Unapproved Minutes of:**

1. **10-06-09** Board Meeting
2. **09-29-09 Parks & Recreation Advisory**
3. **10-14-09 Shoreline Preservation Advisory**

**Action:**

**b) Approve 09-28-09 and 10-19-09 Planning Commission meeting minutes**

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**2. Correspondence:** None

**3. Limited Public Comment:**

Rachelle Babcock, 4261 Bartlett Rd, said that the Cherry Blossom deep-injection well had been approved; Carstens, Zollinger, and Babcock indicated they had expected to receive minutes of public hearing, but had not received them. Babcock said there may be a chance to appeal.

**4. Presentation - The Grand Vision - Matt McCauley, NW MI Council of Governments, and Marsha Smith, Rotary Charities of Traverse City:**

McCauley: NWMCOG has been involved with the Grand Vision (GV) from the beginning and lobbied to include broader discussion: include greater area viz transportation issues. The GV was born out of controversy over transportation priorities; this conflict was really about land use that expressed itself through transportation, because land use and transportation are intertwined. The Federal Highway Administration and MDOT have recognized this relationship; NWMCOG worked with Senator Levin to reallocate money, and the federal

language for the study (that became the GV) was for “land use and transportation”; however transportation is at the core of the project.

The GV began with 6 workshops that had >3,000 participants; approx. 12,000 people submitted scorecards; these approx. 15,000 participants represent about 8.5% of the region, which is unprecedented (high). The residents are proud of the region and care about how growth happens. The scorecard process was self-selecting and drew a lot of nontraditional stakeholders; e.g., 20% of the participants were high school students aged 15-18 years. Self-selection means the results may not represent region properly; follow-up, proper opinion survey suggests scorecard results were very accurate. Diverse people appear to have similar views about regional development. From scorecards, “conversation expanded” into even more issues than land use and transportation.

A “sort of executive summary” of public phase was distributed; called “road to prosperity” because it has become an economic-development project in the form of “place-making.” The GV is not a future land use map or master plan for region; it is guiding principles without laying out specifics; map is illustrative not prescriptive; character defined by six issues: investment areas, housing, transportation, farming/food, natural resources, and energy. The GV is a resource, not regulation. (Still awaiting further deliverables.)

Smith: The next challenge is implementation: GV is a strategic framework; Six issues:  
Investment: quality of life is investment goal with high impact; seeks cooperation, teamwork from business, NGOs, govt.  
Transportation: more than just roads. People want growth where infrastructure exists, which is relevant to Acme.  
Housing: includes origin & destination studies  
Food/farm: make for viable and working farmland  
Energy concerns  
Natural resources

Working groups formed to tackle each heading of goals; 100-150 people continue to work on GV. Will hold working session of the six working groups November 19, 2009 at Olson Center from 6:00pm to 8:30pm.

GV resource to provide data, technical assistance, &c. to Boards and Planning Commissions that request it; seeking sources of funding.

Questions from public/PC:  
Gene Veliquette: he listens and doesn't see where money is coming from, successes obtained, or how GV can help  
Smith: Visioning is a process, not specific. Money came from Feds originally, through state. The goal is to plan for land use and then have transportation respond to where it is needed. Has data, framework to use data, and seeking more money.  
McCauley: Usually plan locally, act broadly; GV is chance to plan based on fact that people are mobile and live, work regionally.

Rachelle Babcock: Is there a specific guide for Acme?  
Smith: GV has data, not specific vision or plan  
McCauley: will provide data on request  
Smith: GV principles about village centers, farmland preservation, and shoreline, the same things Acme is working on.

Vermetten: Sees GV as resource, huge asset, esp. for small community like Acme

Smith: And GV wants to provide resources to think regionally as well

Ken Engles: Participated in input, but concerned that working groups may not continue to represent regional views/values

Smith: No mechanism in place at this time

McCauley: Hopes diversity in groups will keep them on track; however, interested in improving this aspect

Carstens: Gap analysis? Other reports?

McCauley: Coming from consultants who are still working on deliverables.

David: Do they need local bodies to declare support?

Smith: Not yet, so far GV is being presented

McCauley: Support coming from more grass roots level; however, can provide sample resolutions for general support, not specific

White: What is the difference between “implementing” and just telling us what to do?

McCauley: 1. “Implementation” usually based in physical work; however, this is more “notional”: policy based rather than project based. 2. Townships hold authority to implement; GV wants to help them do that

Smith: Not telling PC what to do, but what citizens want, and seek to provide resources to locals

White: How do we know regional opinions match Acme opinions?

Smith: proper sample shows great consistency among respondents; available online; very detailed demographics

McCauley: Not technically valid at township level. It is up to Acme to decide what to do with this information; there are far more similarities than differences.

Zollinger: Involving counties first?

McCauley: Involving counties and townships concurrently. The authority to implement is at local level; hence local units are key.

Zollinger: PC talks about growth, housing, farmland, energy: they look like very big things, but they may match regional values/views and Acme values/views

Vermetten: We’re doing a lot of this stuff already; it’s a good tool for us to use.

Carstens: Process was bottom up rather than top down and result was validation of Acme plans

Yamaguchi: Echoes what Carstens said. Broad strokes which give rise to useful goals.

Veliquette: “No one can be against planning”; there’s been validation of Acme Master Plan. The trouble is not with the PC; The PC has consistently passed things on to the Board; things need to be approved in a timely manner.

## 5. **Public Hearings:**

### a) **Proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment #004 - Accessory Buildings**

Hull summarized explanation for proposed amendment: Variance requests frequent enough to warrant an ordinance amendment if the Township so desires.

Public hearing opened at 7:56 pm. There was no public comment. Public hearing closed at 7:57 pm.

David: Feels the rule is for people who have to look at others’ front yards, and so waterfront

properties shouldn't get special treatment.

White: How often do these requests arise?

Hull: Two or three a year — not certain at this time — plus some who express interest but do not put in application.

Hardin: If many get weeded out, should consider David's point

White: If many want front-yard placement unnecessarily, should consider that as well

Carstens: Has the township ever received complaints about front-yard accessory buildings?

Hull: Never

Feringa: lives on waterfront parcel; accessory bldgs in front yard all up and down his street; not an issue there, doesn't see problem here

Zollinger moves to recommend proposed amendment 004 to Township Board for approval.

Second by Yamaguchi

In favor: White, Zollinger, Harden, Carstens, Yamaguchi, Feringa, Vermetten

Opposed: David

Motion passes

**6. Old Business:**

- a) **Status Update – SUP/Site Plan Review Application 2009-01P, Village at Grand Traverse Phase I**

Vermetten summarized memo in packet from twp manager Vreeland

**7. New Business:**

Zollinger brought up dangerous buildings. Hull indicated that legal counsel Jeff Jocks is working on an ordinance for the Board to adopt if it wishes

David reminded those attending about adaptive reuse seminar on Thursday

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

Veliquette: Regarding proposed amendment 004, David is correct, but is everybody else, which illustrates why we need to address the existing ordinance; to understand this, read the "roadmap" document provided by legal to explain the VGT review standards — the document is so difficult to read because the ordinance can be read to say anything, and that's why it's hard to get anything done. Another example is the Grand Vision, which showed that Acme is on the right track.

**ADJOURN**

Motion by David, second by Zollinger, passed unanimously. Adjourn at 8:20 pm.