



**ACME TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
WILLIAMSBURG BANQUET AND CONFERENCE CENTER
4230 EAST M-72, WILLIAMSBURG
7:00 p.m. Monday, September 26, 2011**

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

Members present: J. Zollinger (Chair), B. Carstens (Vice Chair), C. David, S. Feringa, R. Hardin, V. Tegel, K. Wentzloff, D. White

Members excused: P. Yamaguchi

Staff Present: S. Vreeland, Township Manager/Recording Secretary
P. Kilkenny, Deputy Zoning Administrator & Planner
J. Jocks, Legal Counsel

INQUIRY AS TO CONFLICTS OF INTEREST: None noted.

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

1. Continuing Education/Special Presentations: None
2. Consent Calendar: Motion by David, support by White to approve the Consent Calendar as amended to remove discussion of the 08/29/11 Planning Commission meeting to New Business, including:
 - a) Receive and File:
 1. Draft Unapproved Minutes of:
 - a. Board 9/6/11
 2. Planning, Zoning & Administrative Update – S. Vreeland
 3. Planning & Zoning News August 2011
 - b) Approval:
 1. ~~Minutes of the 08/29/2011 Planning Commission Meeting~~

Motion carried unanimously.

3. Limited Public Comment: None
4. Correspondence:
 - a) 09-26-11 e-mail from Cynthia E, Whittaker, 4163 Windward Way, regarding **Proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment 014**: summarized aloud for the public and available on the township website.
5. Reports: None
6. Public Hearings:
 - a) SUP Application 2011-01P – Traverse Bay RV Park (continued from 05/23/11): Fred Campbell of JML Design Group, consultant to the applicant was present in support of the application. Kilkenny summarized the application and the project history for the audience. He noted two errors in his staff report: 1) on page 8 under “standards for site plan review” it was

noted that the proposed configuration of the improvements on each campsite did not conform to setback requirements. However recent Zoning Ordinance Amendment 016 specifically exempted campsites from these setback requirements. 2) On page 13, general standards #2, the second bold statement says that the required 50' setback *is* not observed but should have read *may not be* observed. Kilkenny did not personally observe the setback distance. He noted that the applicant has provided an updated drawing that highlights the required setback distances relative to proposed site improvements. A DEQ permit notes a stream (a branch of Yuba Creek) as being present on the site. The new map was created to demonstrate the required 75' setback between the stream and the sanitary system septic fields, and the required 50' setback between the stream and any proposed parking areas or structures on campsites. Tegel and Carstens were previously concerned with this issue.

Public Hearing opened at 7:15 p.m.

David Crannell, owner of lot 196 in the RV Park for 6 years, is the current president of the condo association at the park. He is speaking only as an individual and not on behalf of the association. He also submitted an e-mail detailing his reasons for opposing the proposed expansion. He asserted that 40% of the existing 217 lots are currently for sale and that the current developer will not accept additional lots for resale. There is concern that property values in the park will decline and the township tax base will be reduced accordingly. 10 lots were sold this year, which is a better sales rate than last year, but Mr. Crannell does wonder why a permit might be issued for lots that may not be currently saleable. The roadways in the park were not designed for construction traffic, and there is concern about their use in this regard. There are no sidewalks in the development, and no buffer between the roadway and private property. It is currently not permissible for anyone to be on a lot that is not their own. Few places are available for pet walking within the development, so it happens largely within the roadways. Additional construction traffic would make it dangerous for pedestrians and children riding bicycles on the narrow roads. Therefore he feels it would be appropriate that a separate construction entrance be provided. Mr. Crannell is also concerned about traffic safety, particularly for those who turn left into the RV Park with long vehicles from M-72, and particularly if there is additional traffic related to development of a new Meijer store. He believes the developer should have to provide a separate entrance to the expansion area, and possibly a traffic signal. Mr. Crannell is also concerned with possible environmental damage. The developer owns about 90% of the undeveloped land in the project and there is no plan to ever turn this area over to the lot owners in the condominium association. The only area where pets can be off-leash is near Yuba Creek, and this area sometimes becomes swampy. Mr. Crannell believes the owner should relocate the dog-walking area to a less environmentally-sensitive place and that the area provided for off-leash exercise be fenced to protect wildlife. He asserted that an area adjacent to a wetland area is being used to dump construction wastes. Mr. Crannell mentioned that the proposed coach houses tend to include kitchen and sleeping areas, and hopes that they are being held to appropriate fire prevention standards that take those uses of the building in the property.

Frank Campbell owns lot 205 in the RV Park and is very concerned about the proposed expansion for safety reasons. He notes that there is the possibility of a roundabout on M-72 to serve the proposed Meijer development. The RV Park is only about a quarter mile from the Lautner/M-72 intersection. RVs

are large and slow moving, and the existing acceleration/deceleration lane facilities are insufficient to be truly safe. Mr. Campbell expressed some of the same concerns about the protection of Yuba Creek, the location of the dog walking area, and the impact on the stream when this area floods or there is rain. He feels that the application does not adequately address these concerns.

Al and Shirley Hirt own lot 80 and sent an e-mail opposing the RV Park expansion. They mentioned the high number of lots currently available for sale – at least 80 out of 217. He asserted that additional lots are listed for sale through other avenues, and that already people are selling lots for lower values. Mr. Hirt expressed concerns about mistakes made in previous approval processes related to the RV Park and whether they should have an impact on the current situation.

Public Hearing closed at 7:29 p.m.

Zollinger asked if staff had looked into the situation with the dog run location; they have not. Carstens feels that this area near two branches of Yuba Creek is sensitive and he is somewhat uncomfortable with the expansion proposal. However, if the DEQ has granted permits and the Health Department is willing to as well, he is uncertain whether the township has much grounds for concern. He does feel that the amount of development should be limited near sensitive wetlands areas. Carstens wondered if campsite users might feel constricted by the small lots and make many trips in and out of the site.

David expressed sympathy for the concerns raised by speakers this evening. As to concerns about whether additional inventory of lots is needed or would impact the value of existing lots, he feels that this is not precisely within the township's purview. He would want the staff to look into the concerns raised regarding the dog run and potential construction waste dumpsite. Increased development in the township will have an impact on traffic, and it may be felt more strongly by the RV park due to proximity and the nature of the vehicles involved.

Tegel asked about the percentage of impervious surface within the development, and wondered whether the M-72 Corridor Study would have anything to say about this project. Members of the public have raised questions about whether the project is socially and economically desirable. She also wonders how the township addresses the question of the accessory buildings being inhabited. Vreeland noted that the applicant did discuss use of the buildings for kitchen and entertaining facilities, although she didn't specifically recall if sleeping space was discussed. David recalled that sleeping bunks in the coach houses was discussed, and had thought that fire department conditions has been satisfied.

Motion by Hardin, support by David to recommend that the Board of Trustees approve SUP/Site Plan Application 2011-01P.

Wentzloff asked to what extent the question of traffic impacts has been addressed. MDOT provided a letter in 2009 stating that the expansion would not require any expansion of existing acceleration/deceleration lanes. This is not a permit, but a response to a request for information from the township. Mr. Fred Campbell stated that MDOT was consulted in 2009 and 2011

regarding the proposed expansion and requested no changes. Tegel reiterated her questions regarding the M-72 Corridor Study. Zollinger agreed with David that in the case of a campground the township is not charged with the assessment of market need.

Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

b) SUP/Site Plan Approval Application #2009-01P – Village at Grand Traverse LLC (continued)

- [Township Consultant and public agency analysis](#)
- [Application Materials](#)
- [VGT Response to Consultant and public agency analysis](#)
- [Commissioner Questions](#)
- [Submitted Public Comment](#)
- [Beckett & Raeder PowerPoint](#)

This continued session of the public hearing will begin with a presentation by the township's planning, traffic and environmental consultants, followed by some response from representatives for the applicant, and then followed by opening the floor to additional public comment. Presenters for the township's consultants were: John Iacoangeli – Beckett & Raeder (general planning), Stephen Dearing – OHM (traffic), and Dr. Christopher Grobbel – Grobbel Environmental (environmental).

Iacoangeli began the presentation of the 39-page compiled technical review findings. The review performed is geared towards ensuring that as each proposed phase of the development is presented for approval it respects the requirements of the Conceptual SUP granted to the project and complies with all applicable site planning requirements. Phase I is approximately 22 acres in size out of the entire 180 acres and is proposed to contain a Meijer store. The Conceptual SUP is recorded with the GT County Register of Deeds. Iacoangeli reviewed a list of the conditions contained in the SUP, such as phasing, density and land use mix, dimensional standards, water and sewer, landscaping, limitation on large-scale retail, stormwater control, environmental features, dark sky features, architectural features and master condominium document requirements.

The Phase I proposal was reviewed by local agencies required to provide input to the township jointly through the GT County Land Development Review Committee in 2009. Access to and impact on adjacent and network-wide traffic infrastructure was mentioned as a particular concern. Iacoangeli began a discussion of the status of his review of a variety of SUP requirements. He also discussed a series of 9 broader issues regarding the proposal, ending with the reminder that this development will set the tone for the future of the M-72 corridor and the entire township. Concerns that exist in terms of meeting the requirements of the Conceptual SUP are largely concerned with the design of the traffic flow on the site, as well as the architectural design. Some other required elements, such as recorded access easements to the boundaries of adjacent properties, recorded easements for non-motorized trails, and documents that hold tenants in the development to the development guidelines whether the site becomes a condominium or lots are sold off have not yet been provided.

Dearing spoke to his review of the traffic study. He explained what a traffic study is, why you do it and what you should gain from it. The Conceptual SUP requires a traffic study for each phase of the development. Such a study allows you to understand baseline current conditions, anticipate future conditions, measure the

likely impacts and identify ways to mitigate the impacts. He explained some of the technical jargon associated with traffic engineering. He mentioned that to the layperson going to the store is one round trip, but to the traffic engineer it is two trips: one outgoing and one return. “Pass-by” trips are stops you make that you didn’t plan, simply because you were passing by. A “diverted link” trip would be of the type where you live in Elk Rapids and are heading home from your job in Traverse City, but you make a planned diversion down M-72 to the store to pick up something on the way home. A key component of this concept is that you have to turn off your main route to get to the interim destination and then return back to the main route. “Internal capture trips” consist of traffic that stays within the development and does not exit onto nearby public roads. They generally only occur when a development contains a mixture of residential and commercial uses. “Peak periods” or “peak hours” are generally morning and evening commuter “rush hours.” Most of the impacts from the proposed development were found to be associated with weekday evening rush hours. “Level of Service” (LOS) is how traffic engineers assign a letter grade to the amount of delay a driver experiences in a situation. As in school, “A” is a great grade, and “F” is a failing grade. Most road agencies will try to maintain an LOS C (some people get stopped at points on the route, but many travel through without stopping) in a relatively rural area. In suburban and urban settings, LOS D (many vehicles stop, and few progress through a series of signals without stopping, you can count on having to wait for at least one signal for at least one signal cycle, and you hope the wait isn’t longer) is considered “tolerable.” More congestion and delays translate into driver irritation, which translates into actions which cause more accidents.

Dearing displayed existing LOS at a variety of signalized and stop-sign controlled intersections in the local traffic network. The lights at Bunker Hill and at M-72 on US 31 currently have an evening peak time LOS of B. the US 31/Mt. Hope Road intersection has an LOS C, Mt. Hope/M-72 has an LOS B, but the Lautner Road legs of the M-72/Lautner intersection both have an LOS F – traffic on M-72 is so heavy that traffic waiting to turn on or off of Lautner Road will experience significant delays and may cause traffic backups on M-72.

Traffic to be generated by the proposed Meijer store in Phase I was projected based on statistics provided by the International Traffic Engineers (ITE) – the industry standard. About 560 completely new trips per day related to a Meijer store are projected (net of pass-by and diverted link trips.) The distribution of trips was also studied. The most startling statistic is an expectation that 1 of every 4 people returning towards Traverse City from the proposed store are projected to take Lautner Road south to Bunker Hill rather than using M-72 E and US 31 N. Some people are concerned that this projection might be too low. Next the study looked at the impact of the new development on the LOS at the intersections discussed earlier. The signalized intersections would drop from LOS B to C, with Lautner Road/M-72 remaining at LOS F. Dearing also covered traffic projections for full development buildout. The Bunker Hill/US 31 intersection LOS drops to D overall, but F for the Bunker Hill leg. The US 31/M-72 intersection and nearly all other intersections drop to LOS F.

The applicant, township, township consultants, MDOT and the Road Commission have been discussion potential ways to effectively and safely manage the expected traffic increases and impacts as projected – mitigation that restores the road system to acceptable function. Two solution alternatives were examined. The first is a fairly traditional boulevard on M-72 with indirect “Michigan” left turns with 2 lanes in each direction with strategically-placed crossovers for turns. Some of the crossovers are projected to handle so much traffic that they would have to be 2 lanes each. This

has implications for how big the boulevard median would have to be, and standards indicate it might have to be up to 70' wide. At widths much lower it would be difficult for large trucks or other large vehicles to maneuver safely. On Lautner Road it is projected that the need would be for a 3-lane road (one in each direction plus common left-turn lane) plus occasional right turns. At full project buildout there would have to be improvements at M-72 and US 31, including a boulevard on US 31 with dual eastbound turn lanes, crossovers and traffic turning left from M-72 to head south to Traverse City would have to remain direct left turns. At US 31 and Bunker Hill, the key concern is that two left turn lanes would be needed for westbound Bunker Hill traffic to head south to Traverse City. If all these improvements were made the LOS would return to mostly B, with one C at Bunker Hill Road. As many as 6 new signals would have to be added within a mile and a half on M-72 at various points or for various movements, and 2 new signals on US 31.

The second option for traffic impact mitigation is to use roundabouts. There could be 2 2-lane roundabouts, one at Lautner Road and one at the main entrance to the development, plus another one eventually at US 31. A 1-lane roundabout could be created at the main project access on Lautner Road. Narrow boulevards could be employed to ensure that minor driveways along the highway corridor are right-in, right-out only. The medians don't have to be wide because large vehicles don't turn around them; they make their u-turns in the roundabouts. With this option the LOS at most intersections is brought to A, with an LOS C at Bunker Hill and M-72. This is an unconventional approach in Traverse City.

In general the applicant's traffic impact study was deemed of good quality by township consultants and the road agencies. A few minor technical corrections that were requested have received a favorable response. Dearing concurs with the study's findings that significant traffic impacts will result from the development, and feels that the applicant has provided two viable options for adequately addressing the impacts. Dearing recommends that the township strongly consider the roundabout option because they tend to be significantly safer than signalized intersections because they contain fewer conflict points. Crash patterns in roundabouts tend to be side-swipes and rear-ends, which tend to produce fewer injuries and fatalities than the head-on and t-bone accidents that occur at signalized intersections. The roundabout option would also result in the highest LOS and least delay for drivers. As additional development occurs and traffic increases above and beyond that studied relative to the project, roundabouts have more reserve capacity than traditional intersections. They can also help change driver attitudes as they transition between wide open, high-speed rural roads to more urbanized areas. Roundabouts keep traffic moving but also slow it down as it enters more developed areas. A 2-lane roundabout takes some room; one could not be created at US 31/M-72 without displacing existing buildings. However, in general roundabouts can be created with much less impervious surface creation than traditional options and with less impact on landowners. Roundabouts don't have to be centered in intersections – feeder roads can come in from offset directions. It would be easier to create a series of roundabouts one section at a time, while it is more difficult to create a boulevard highway in sections and it generally requires a lot of temporary pavement sections that come and go.

A brief recess was declared from 9:12 – 9:17 p.m.

Grobber gave his discussion of the environmental review for the application. He stated a strong suggestion that no stormwater be allowed to reach Acme Creek, a prime trout stream, under any circumstances. He expressed a general recommendation that the stormwater management design provided by the applicant to date does not implement a sufficient level of best management practices, and that

impervious surface in the project should be reduced. Grobbel is also concerned that even internally the project is entirely automobile-dependent and that the design does not promote walking or other non-motorized transportation between different portions of the development.

To ensure that public comment is heard, the applicant has agreed to opening the floor to public comment prior to beginning their response to the application analysis.

Public Hearing reconvened at 9:25 p.m.

Gayle Hanna, 3000 Mt. Vernon Rd, Midland is a property owner in Acme Township. She felt that the questions she asked at the last meeting were addressed by Grobbel's comments. Can pervious pavement surfaces be used where prudent in the development to reduce stormwater runoff. Another of her questions was whether the project can be designed to be visually appealing, as was done at Grand Traverse Crossings and at Oleson's East. Large steep detention basins can represent a danger, particularly to children and the elderly, so if they exist there needs to be an effective barrier around them. Mrs. Hanna was pleased to hear Grobbel say that these things need to be done. A precedent for buildout of the development and other developments is being set.

Audrey Ritter, 5532 Lautner Road lives across the street from the proposed development. She is concerned because Meijer has not mown or otherwise groomed or cared for the property they own on the southeast corner of Lautner and M-72. She is particularly concerned with the invasive Autumn Olive growing on the site and wonders if there is something the township and/or the DNR can do about it. She mentioned that last year someone was deer hunting on the property and some of their shots penetrated her garage. Otherwise she stated she will welcome Meijer and will walk to their store from her house.

Howard Schelde, owner of TraVino Restaurant on M-72, has made a significant investment in the property. He renovated a long-vacant building. He stated that the township Board at the time promised him that there would be some additional development. Since that time there has not only been little or no new development, but many former businesses have closed or relocated. Businesses need company to survive, and he is hopeful that the project will eventually be approved.

Diana Morgan, 779 Lost Nations Trail in Peninsula Township was at one time an Acme Planning Commissioner. She has always supported "intelligent growth." She sang a portion of the song "They Paved Paradise and Put in a Parking Lot."

Tom Elliott and his brother David own a property on S. Lautner Road. Many of the properties in this area have a high water table and have problems with their septic systems. If this project is going to be served by the regional sanitary sewer system, he wonders if service could be extended to some of the properties south on Lautner Road as well. Mr. Elliott is also curious about the nature of the landscaped buffer on the south side of the project and is concerned that a 25' setback will be insufficient to adequately screen the tall apartment buildings planned for that portion of the project.

Jim Lively is with the Michigan Land Use Institute (MLUI). He has been involved in the history of this project for many years. He understands that the project is moving forward and some of the constraints the Planning Commission is facing in its review. The traffic and market analysis have implications on a regional level, and stated that Acme Township has regional support for "sound" development. During the past 3 years The Grand Vision has been a regional discussion about the nature of preferred

growth for the region and how regional transportation should be handled. One of Mr. Lively's concerns is that the discussion of traffic earlier related exclusively to automobile use and did not consider the impacts of transit planning and opportunities of linkages to the TART. Park and ride could be part of this type of project. He encouraged the township to bring regional multi-modal transportation agencies into the discussion, and told the Commission it is fortunate to have Carstens as a member in this regard. The Chamber of Commerce would likely be glad to help the township understand the impacts on the entire regional market. Mr. Lively stated that the other agencies will not come to the township and offer their help; they will wait until the township, specifically the Board, requests their input and assistance. He echoed the comments by Iacoangeli that design is of tremendous importance and will create a legacy.

Zollinger noted that discussions relative to this project with BATA and TART have occurred.

Charlene Abernethy, 4312 Westridge Drive asked the Commission to listen to Dr. Grobbel. She has been researching stormwater management and feels he is not exaggerating the potential impacts on Acme Creek.

Rachelle Babcock, Bartlett Road provided and read [written comment](#) regarding Meijer's proposed signage plan. She quoted a portion of the recent letter from Gourdie Fraser on behalf of the applicant that says the township will have to tell them very specifically what it expects in term of architectural design, and opines that the township's consultants are being insensitive to commercial branding needs. Ms. Babcock feels that the comments made are an indication that Meijer is insensitive to the township's Master Plan and how it wants to present itself. She quoted from the township's customary signage ordinances as to wall sign signage, and noted that the proposed Meijer wall signage significantly exceeds the standard maximum amount allowed. She sees this as an indicator of a larger underlying problem; that Meijer expects the township to change its standards to suit them, rather than conforming their plans to our standards. She suggested that the plan be tabled until a plan agreeable to all parties can be reached.

Jim Heffner and Donna Hagan, 4050 Bayberry Lane, live just off Bartlett Road. Mr. Heffner helped to develop the VASA trail initially. He has shopped at Meijer stores for over 40 years. He would like them to be part of our community, but not the "800 pound gorilla" dictating to the community how we will grow. He plans to visit the Hartland Township store since it has been mentioned so often. He appreciates the use of native species in landscaping to minimize the use of pesticides and other potential negative impacts. During the break he heard two people speak positively about roundabouts, which surprised him because many people are afraid of them. Mr. Heffner is familiar with them through trips to Ann Arbor and confirmed that they can handle higher volumes of traffic more efficiently with fewer and less severe accidents and hopes they will be seriously considered. People who live in the Bunker Hill Road area know that there is a blind spot at the intersection with Bartlett Road that needs to be corrected. The TART and VASA attract many bikers, but Bunker Hill Road is in poor condition and in most places has no shoulders. He was concerned that he didn't hear a discussion of how bikers will be served and protected. Mr. Heffner would also like to hear discussion about continuation of the TART between Bunker Hill and Lautner Roads. During the Grand Vision meetings there was a lot of discussion about village design and identity. This has been a particular issue for Acme historically, and he would love to see Acme develop its own village identity. Acme can be along at least 3 good routes for regional light rail transportation.

Howard Yamaguchi, 6364 Singletree Lane is also a TART board member. Regarding the gap in the TART, discussions have been ongoing with VGT. VGT has been offering TART very broad scope for laying out trails within their development, and TART will be presenting their proposal in that regard to the VGT soon. The segment between Bunker Hill Road and the VGT is a different problem, but TART is confident that within VGT the trail will be developed. Mr. Yamaguchi also hopes that roads within the VGT development will consider the complete streets design initiative.

Gene Veliquette, 8369 Elk Lake Road is part of a farming family that owns significant property in Acme Township including the Shoreline Fruit processing plant. He believes all of his family and employees support the development of a Meijer store here, and that the township is not well served by a delay in accomplishing this. What is Acme Township trying to preserve in terms of identity if much of it is boarded up and there are no jobs? He is concerned as to why the applicant should have to answer questions about all phases of the development at phase 1, and if their plans change they may have to entirely start from scratch? There is never going to be complete agreement on every aspect of the plan. Mr. Veliquette asserted that the courts indicated that the project could be built, and the township should allow it to be built. He is also concerned that the township's advisors took up so much of the meeting time when as a citizen he is asked to keep his comments brief. He felt some of the consultant's comments were arrogant, particularly those guaranteeing that if steps aren't taken Acme Creek will be ruined. Who is considering the people who aren't getting paychecks? Who is considering the workers at the processing plant who need to shop for groceries on their way home. Mr. Veliquette feels that the consultants only raised many additional questions, and that the township zoning ordinance is unreadable and too subjective. He feels it is inappropriate for applicants to have to answer so many questions in their initial application, and that the process leaves too little room for citizen input. His farming operation appreciates the township's support of agriculture, but they would appreciate having a place to sell their product to and to serve their employees. Mr. Veliquette noted that Elk Rapids developed successfully prior to zoning.

Paul Brink, 9617 Winter Road asked whether the applicant still really wants to develop as massive a project as they proposed in 2004. Is it still realistic today? Or, are they just using the Conceptual SUP approved then to obtain development of a single big box store? Eventually there could be one big box store on each corner of M-72 and S. Lautner Road, with their backsides and loading docks facing passing traffic. How will this look, and how will it function? Instead, what if the developers abandoned the 2004 SUP as not being the best plan for today, perhaps sought rezoning for a portion of their property to a commercial designation, and working with the township to come up with a development plan that would be more agreeable to everyone. The township could abandon the idea of this location as a future town center and focus its efforts elsewhere, such as along the shoreline.

David Starkey, 3554 Scenic Hills Drive lives near Bunker Hill Road. He asked whether semi truck traffic would be banned from Bunker Hill Road. He also noted that the Road Commission's letters to the township mention concerns about the condition of Bunker Hill Road and the fact that they don't have money to pay for repairs. Who will pay? Will it be a township millage? A special assessment on property owners fronting the road?

Robert Evina, Woodland Creek Furniture and Acme Business Association, noted that last month the Planning Commission considered a request for rezoning. He stated that he has it on good authority that Wal-Mart was behind that proposal, and that Wal-

Mart has also indicated willingness to purchase the VGT property from the current owners. He feels that they are the real “800 pound gorilla” that would break the community, and that Acme Township should not impose expensive requirements and restrictions on this developer. Otherwise they may sell to Wal-Mart, a non-Michigan business, that would be worse for the community.

Chris Stoppel lives on Deepwater Point Road and has a business on M-72 East, and he would like to have new commercial neighbors. There have been enough studies, and it’s time for action.

Public Hearing recessed at 10:08 p.m.

Pete LaMourie from Progressive AE performed the traffic study for the applicant. He felt Dearing did a good job of summarizing the process to date. Two potential alternatives for addressing the traffic issues have been developed, and the issues have been studied relative to both Phase I and full VGT buildout. Generally Mr. LaMourie agrees that along with the township’s consultants and MDOT the applicant would support the use of roundabouts on M-72 and perhaps also one on Lautner Road.

Terry Boyd from Gourdie Fraser is the Project Manager for Anderson Real Estate. He spoke with JR Anderson this morning, who couldn’t attend this meeting due to weather cancelling plane flights. They perceive two key sticking points. The first is the architectural rendering for the Meijer store. Meijer and VGT are indicating to Mr. Boyd that they believe they are meeting the requirements for architectural standards for Phase I. They can talk further, but Mr. Anderson’s feeling is that they can’t choose today what the development will look like because they don’t really know what will be built there tomorrow. How a developer can set the standard for the development when they feel that the Meijer may in fact do this is something they don’t understand. Resolving this issue may require more direct discussion between Meijer architects and Iacoangeli.

The second key issue is the stormwater management. Mr. Boyd feels that a conservative approach to stormwater management has been used, and that soils on this site will not accept infiltration from detention basins. He stated that the Drain Commissioner requires infiltration tests 5” below the bottom of detention basins, and basins have to be designed to handle twice the amount the tests indicate can be handled. If the soils will handle infiltration they can redesign the stormwater controls accordingly.

Mr. Boyd feels that the applicant is “95%” of the way towards meeting the requirements for the project. He suggested that the Planning Commission draft a list of conditions for approval that he could present to Mr. Anderson for his consideration. Mr. Boyd also asked for a vote on the project at the October Planning Commission meeting.

Zollinger asked if there was any additional public comment after the consultant’s comments. Ms. Morgan said again that she was a Planning Commissioner, and she served during earlier considerations regarding this project. At one time she asked for consideration of using the design for the Scio Township Meijer store, and Meijer representative Scott Nowakowski replied with a flat “no.” She stated that Mr. Veliquette’s comments interested her because he lives in Peninsula Township where there will never be big box stores. (Several members of the public offered the correction that Mr. Veliquette lives in Whitewater Township.)

Mrs. Hanna offered the concern that Bunker Hill Road will be unable to handle

increased truck traffic.

Motion by Carstens, support by David to continue the discussion of application 2009-01P at the October 24 Planning Commission meeting.

Tegel is very concerned with environmental impacts related to the project. It is regrettable that the slideshow for his portion of the presentation malfunctioned, and she would like to have it fully presented at the next meeting. Zollinger suggested that the presentation can be delivered in written form before the next meeting. Tegel and David both stated that they would like to receive the presentation at the next meeting.

David asked if a vote on the project at the next meeting is a realistic goal. David and Zollinger both said they don't believe this is likely, with Zollinger adding that he does want to complete the process both efficiently and prudently. It was new information that the applicant is offering to have more discussion about the design. The Commission also needs time to fully discuss and deliberate on the application. David noted that to this point they have received much paper but have not been involved in the discussion of the project at all.

Motion carried unanimously.

7. Old Business: None

8. New Business:

- a) **Minutes of the [08/29/2011 Planning Commission Meeting](#):** Tegel's notes from the meeting indicated that during the VGT presentation J.R. Anderson stated that best management practices for stormwater management would be employed. However, Tegel did not find this statement reflected in the minutes and feels it is important to have it there. Mr. Boyd confirmed that the statement had been made. It was suggested to add a sentence in this regard to the end of the second paragraph about the VGT presentation.

Motion by White, support by Wentzloff to approve the 08/29/11 Planning Commission meeting minutes as corrected. Motion carried unanimously.

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

- a) [McKenna Associates Bulletin – Temporary land Uses](#)
- b) [Grand Vision 2011 Report to the Community – September 27](#)
- c) [Annual County Planning Awards Nominations](#)
- d) [Planning Michigan 2011 Conference Brochure](#)

Tegel mentioned that she works with the Watershed Center on the Adopt a Stream program on Yuba Creek. They look for macroinvertebrates.

James Hanna, 3000 Mt. Vernon Rd., Midland grew up on Deepwater Point. He will be 75 years old soon, and saw wonderful water quality when he was young. When the motels came along they drew water from the bay and discharged to the bay, and they damaged what he treasured as a boy. Mr. Hanna believes that Meijer can be a good thing, but they do need to be careful of the environment.

Meeting adjourned at 10:30 p.m.