



**ACME TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
ACME TOWNSHIP HALL  
6042 Acme Road, Williamsburg MI 49690  
December 8, 2014, 7:00 p.m.**

**CALL TO ORDER WITH PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AT 7:02pm**

**ROLL CALL:**

**Members Present:** J. Demarsh, M. Binkley, B. Finch, D.Rosa, S. Feringa, M. Timmins, T. Forgette  
**Members Excused:** K. Wentzloff, D.White  
**Staff Present:** J. Jocks, Legal Counsel  
N. Lennox, Zoning Administrator  
**Recording Secretary:** T. Forgette

**A. LIMITED PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Public Comment periods are provided at the beginning and end of each meeting agenda. Members of the public may address the Board regarding any subject of community interest during these periods. Comment during other portions of the agenda may or may not be entertained at the moderator's discretion.

No Public Comment. Closed at 7:04pm

**B. SPECIAL PRESENTATION: Northwest Continuum of Care Homelessness Housing**

Tina Allen – Grand Traverse Area Continuum of Care (COC)

Cecil McNally – Goodwill Industries of Northern Michigan

Melodie Linebaugh – Northwest Michigan Community Action Agency

Presented to the planning commission and provided a handout.

The COC is a collaboration of individuals and agencies that server those facing homelessness in Antrim, Benzie, Grand Traverse, Kalkaska and Leelanau Counties. Also part of the 10 -county Northwest Michigan COC. Because the COC exists member agencies receive over 1 million dollars annually for prevention, rapid rehousing, street outreach, emergency shelter, permanent supportive housing and support services Earlier this year, the GT COC began a Housing Work Group that focuses on ways that the COC can be the voice of those facing homelessness when community housing decisions are being made. We are trying to help define that there is something before just a need for affordable housing, as there are people being housed or serviced by other programs.

Agencies have money and programs to help; but housing is limited and just not available. Two important parts they are concentrating on are 1) Get word out to the community and 2) Helping communities make it a priority Work with local decision makers to ad; lack of affordable housing.

Groups working on housing issues are COC, Housing Solutions Network, County Collaborative Councils, County Housing Task Forces, and Planning Commissions

Community Resources include Goodwill Industries, Pete' Place, NMCAA, local churches (Safe Harbor), Women's Resource Center, Northwest Michigan Supportive Housing, Homestretch Nonprofit Housing Development Corporation, Habitat for Humanity, and Jubilee Center.

**Types of Housing**

Emergency Shelter- For people who are literally homeless; individuals and families who are in immediate need

Transitional Housing- Project designed to provide housing and appropriate supportive services to homeless persons to facilitate movement to independent living with 24 months

Permanent Supportive Housing- Project based rentals; approach to subsidized housing designed for

people with very low incomes and chronic, disabling health; less likely to make it on their own.  
Affordable Housing (independent living)- families who pay more than 30 percent of their income for housing are considered cost burdened and may have difficulty affording necessities such as food, clothing, transportation, and medical care.

## Housing Issues

More than 60 percent of jobs in Michigan pay less than \$40,000 per year. 2/3 of jobs pay less than \$20 per hour. US poverty designation is \$23,000 for a family and \$11,000 for a single person. Rentals in the area are more than state average. Average survival budget for a household of four is \$50,345. The United Way ALICE report shows the Grand Traverse County medium household income at \$51,600. Poverty rate is at 4,219 households. Housing affordability for the county is poor and job opportunities are fair. In Acme township, 21% families are below the ALICE Poverty threshold level.

Melodie Linebaugh- Manager of Homeless Prevention for NMCAA – Agency is the first point of contact for those who are experiencing or at risk of being homeless. Each year they receive a grant for those in need of financial assistance for housing. This year was unique in that NMCAA still had money remaining in the final month of the grant cycle. Usually money goes out the door as quickly as it comes in because so many are in need. Why? Because of the housing shortage in our community. It wasn't because there weren't people who need our help or couldn't qualify for the housing. It was a direct result of the lack of safe, affordable housing in the area. A look at the numbers. October and November they took an average of 48 calls per day.

NMCAA – 132 people waiting for housing voucher; including 12 veterans

NM Supportive Housing- 260-300 people waiting for housing.

Women's Resource Center – 30 people which includes children

Goodwill Inn- has 190 in shelter with 10 people with children waiting because it is full

Safe Harbor- averaging 45-55 per day.

How can local government play a role in increasing affordable housing in communities

- Make the issue of affordable housing a priority
- Provide zoning that requires developers to include 15% of proposed housing to be affordable by standards
- Allow accessory dwelling units
- Allow density bonus
- Review Zoning ordinance
- Allow for scaled tax abatements for MSHDA
- Review the benefit fee structure charged to multi-family developments
- Review the cost of fire suppression
- Review the issue of development safety
- Provide guidance
- Provide written support to non-profits
- Reduce the cost of public land purchase for non-profits creating affordable projects
- Coordinate with the GTC Land Bank to increase resources to non-profits
- Encourage state to invest in rural communities especially where water/septic available
- Weigh in when MSHDA presents their Qualified Application Plan.
- Codify accessory buildings

## Questions/Discussions

Rachelle Babcock, 4261 Bartlett Road. Asked if there were agencies special for vets.

Melodie Linebaugh – NMCAA has programs to assist veterans as does Goodwill (Patriot Place). They often work together. There are 24 units available for male veterans.

Jim Hefner, 4050 Bayberry Lane- Didn't really think there was a homeless issue in Acme Township; primarily thought it was a Traverse City issue until last winter. When looking out at VASA trailhead, noticed car that was often there early in the morning. A family, with children were coming there late at night and using heated restrooms.

R. Babcock- that may be happening more as I noticed people parking out in our fields

B. Finch. Curious if anyone help them with taking money out of paychecks to save for housing.  
Melodie- Help with budgeting, however budgeting is usually not the issue. Usually an emergency such as a car breaking down or health problem occurs and they to pay that instead of rent Budgets are tight, not that they aren't trying to save. That is not everybody; there is a small percentage that have difficulties.

B. Finch - As retired teacher could see this coming and its nice to see people are being proactive.

Melodie – Amazing how many school children are homeless. Over 200 children in the Traverse Area. They are good at hiding the fact that they are homeless.

Cecil McNally. Basic budgeting class as part of case plan; 50 to 60% at Goodwill Inn now working. They just don't make enough income or get enough hours to afford housing.

M. Binkley. Experience one night at Big Boy who asked for a ride to the governmental center so they could catch a bus to the church so they would have a place to stay. Asked where they were from and they were from downstate but came up here so they could get a place to live. Do we know how many people come up here because they know they can get a place to stay? .

Cecil McNally. People relocating here to get service is not as big as the perception. Statistics from local agencies report that 76% are from the county and 82% are from the 5 county area, and 92% are from the 10 county area. Most people don't have to come here to find emergency shelters. Other areas have shelters too. Most people that come here have a connection to the area.

Tina. HUD requires a point study by zip code. That is how we find most are from within the area. Beyond that, the number that is nearly impossible to get a number on are the people who are doubled up and precariously housed. Living with a friend or family member. This is the group that are hidden from statistics because they are not getting services. At any moment, they can be living out of their cars. Last year we were able to collect information in our 5 county area with respect to children. There were 802 kids that did not have a home.

John Syche – GT County Planning and Development Director – challenge to housing; trying to find even good rental housing is difficult. Gaining about 1000 people per yer. There are approximately 90,000 people in the county and don't have a strong affordable housing developer in the area other than Goodwill. Market rate units mixed with affordable units. Mid-town development in TC has some mixed in affordable housing (8 units). Market rate unit construction could free up the current units. See a lot of opportunities with public and private. Task force is concentrating on getting more affordable housing for the area.

S. Feringa – this is a difficult task that needs infrastructure but the need is great. As a planning commission we need to look at Master Plan to see what we can do.

**C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA: Motion by Timmins, Binkley second. Motion carries**

**D. INQUIRY AS TO CONFLICTS OF INTEREST: none**

**E. CONSENT CALENDAR: The purpose is to expedite business by grouping non-controversial items together for one Board motion without discussion. A request to remove any item for discussion later in the agenda from any member of the Board, staff or public shall be granted.**

**a) RECEIVE AND FILE:**

**1. Draft Unapproved Minutes of:**

**1. Township Board minutes 11/12/14**

**2. Parks & Recreation Advisory 11/05/14**

**b) ACTION:**

**1. Draft Unapproved Minutes of:**

**1. Planning Commission minutes 11/10/14**

**ITEMS REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT CALENDAR: none**

Motion to receive and file all above minutes and reports.

Motion by Timmins, Second by Finch, None opposed. Motion carried.

**F. CORRESPONDENCE:**  
**Three letters in favor of ordinance amendment recorded as part of the Public Hearing**

**H. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**  
**1. Ordinance Amendment to Article VII Section 7.5.6 Landscaping**

Open to public at 7:55pm

Eric Takayama, Lautner Road– landscaper. Has not read ordinance but heard about it from Jim Hefner. He is in favor of the ordinance and would encourage not only the use of natives, but also restrict the top evasive species and ornamentals. Encourage those who cultivate native plants.

Letter dated 12/8/2014 from Katie Grzesiak, Coordinator, Northwest Michigan Invasive Species Network, spoke in favor

Email dated 12/8/2014 from Dave Barrons spoke in favor

Letter dated 12/8/2014 from Kay Charter, Executive Director, Saving Birds Through Habitat, spoke in favor.

Closed at 7:57pm

J. Jocks – wants to make 2 recommendations for change

D2 – After the effective date of this ordinance

D3 – After January 1, 2015,

Not needed.

Motion to recommend approval with changes by counsel, that we recommend adoption of Ordinance Amendment to Article VII Section 7.5.6 by the board – Timmins, second by Marsh. None opposed. Motion carried.

**I. NEW BUSINESS:**

**a) Planning Commission 2015 Calendar –**

Timmins Motion to approve Resolution #PCR-2014-1, Acme Planning Commission 2015 meeting dates, second by Finch. None opposed. Motion carried

**OLD BUSINESS:**

**a) Advance Auto Site Plan Review**

N. Lennox provided a review of project scope. Final Site Plan Review was provided by John Iacoangeli of Beckett&Raeder. Representatives from the project present are Michael Murray of Advanced Auto, Bill Crain from Anderson and Crain, Inc.. and Pete Doran, Attorney.

Site plan review for construction of a new 6,830 square foot commercial building for an Advanced Auto outlet at 3939 E. M-72. The proposal calls for demolition and redevelopment of the entire site. Demolition requires that this project meet the requirements of the new zoning provisions. The project has shared drive with Lee Plaza.

Sign has been resubmitted as 6 foot high and 30 square feet which complies. Planner has requested the use of porous pavement in the rear parking bays. He recommended against wall pak lighting and awnings on 72 side. Ordinance in business district encourages use of awnings on buildings. Transparent windows should have 42” clearance of shelving. Lack of this setback, defeats the purpose of the transparent windows to allow looking into the store. Landscaping should comply with Recommended Planting Guidelines for Municipalities. Currently awaiting favorable review from Grand Traverse MESA (fire).

Pete Doran – Attorney representing applicant, provided comment of planner review.

Site plan review typically does not impose conditions and there have been conditions and concessions made on the back in forth communications on this site plan. They do have a problem however, regarding items pertaining to awnings, porous pavement, and what goes on behind the glass windows.

Awnings – awnings are encouraged by zoning but they are difficult to maintain and the distance from road. Ordinance says it should be encouraged; not required.

Porous Pavement – expensive and maintenance issues due to clogging. Crain and Gosling and Czuback indicates retention basins meet the ordinance.

Behind glass – Landowner does not feel conditions apply to tenant inside the building. Does not feel this condition should be imposed.

Bill Crain – Anderson and Crain presented on porous pavement. Provided cost estimates from Elmers. Spoke with Tim Lodge – Traverse City Engineer. Test samples done at lot K of Post Office (State and Union). In talking with Tim Lodge, already removed porous concrete. Not recommending porous asphalt in the City of Traverse due to maintenance. Big concern; salts and sands gets into porous pavement and clogs the system. Where does what go when it is clogged is the City's big concern. Elmers provided estimate for both types. About 2.5 times more in cost that cannot be guaranteed how long it will last as part of the stormwater retention. Huge investment for something we don't know how long it will last.

Ordinance implies L.I.D – Michigan Design - Did some research with Low Impact Development of Michigan, there is a design guide for permittees and reviewers. In this manual, infiltration basins such as we proposed do fall under low impact designs. They allow for sediment control, stormwater quality control that reduces temperature, reduces runoff flow volume, provides sediment control, and retains stormwater on site. Stays onsite. If cleaning needed, retention basin can be cleaned easier than porous asphalt. Helps with stormwater quality containing contaminants such as oils, grease, etc.

Clyde Johnson of Gosling Czubak also has maintenance concerns with porous asphalt.

Binkley- What is life span of traditional asphalt and Porous?

Crain - The traditional asphalt 10-15 years average lifespan; Elmers doesn't have any projections for lifespan of porous asphalt.

Timmins – Asked if installation numbers reflect entire site or just the back section as suggested by planner.

Crain – Cost estimates based on entire lot.

Timmins – for park plans, we proposed only 20% of the lot and it was about the same cost. Due to concerns about runoff into the bay we felt this was necessary. Also, is there any way that some plants could be introduced into the basin to help in the stormwater control.

Crain – Concerns with putting plants in the basins is that this is the snow storage area and they could be damaged

Timmins – What kind of plants did you look into? Typically rain garden vegetation used in LID is what many might think of as weeds; can take a lot of impact and are not high maintenance.

Something maybe you could look at.

Rachelle Babcock – What is the retention basin design criteria?

Crain – designed for a 25 year event that the ordinance requires; overflow is designed in case of a 100 year event. Directs water to north and west of site. Plan has been approved by township engineers.

Mike Murray – Awning system comment. We have been developing for Advanced for many years. Petoskey is the first store that awnings have been installed. Untested and maintenance and covers up displays. Petoskey awnings were expensive. Three awnings cost \$15,000. Agreed to do it because the building is on the corner and right on the street. If you are sitting in your vehicle, you can see into the store. Also utilize park lighting on all sides of the Petoskey store which they have not had a problem or complaints from that community. Presented Acme with two different lighting types. Cylinder and points downward. Discussed concerns with window requirements since they are 100

feet off street. Cars traveling 55 mph., when we presented opaque windows, cars will not be able to view building anyway. On safe side, they want to ensure that clean look is preserved. By going to transparent glass, they would want design graphics. By going to transparent, they will have more energy costs. Lose skus by going to 42 inch from window. Affects how they control merchandising and marketing. Marketing changes can occur often inside store. Benefit of transparent glass you get natural lighting. Does it offset energy, don't think so. We have put more windows and glass on than any other store we have done to accommodate zoning.

Binkley – Asked about life span of awnings; how are they holding up in Petoskey weather?

Mike Murray – Not enough time has gone by yet to know.

Feringa – Asked which lighting fixture are you planning to use?.

Mike Murray- You pick. Ok with either choice.

Brought back to the Planning Commission

Timmins – Was wall lighting issue more to do with sign

Feringa – Thinks it was more of aesthetic thing; gooseneck with shroud

Feringa – Agrees with their presentation. This is a site plan review. It is not a Special Use Permit so we don't have leeway to make demands so we have to look at it as a site plan. I don't think we can have a say in what can be done inside or building or even outside aesthetics. I would like to see them dress it up a little to give some character, but doesn't think site plan review can require.

Finch - What kind of maintenance is there with awnings? Wasn't here last meeting so what was said with respect to awnings.

Timmins – Ice buildup.

Feringa – Knows one of the awnings in Suttons Bay collapsed due to snow. Initial cost and maintenance are the issues, but it does make buildings look nicer. Last meeting we discussed the use of awnings to possibly dress up the building but thought they were more recommendations than requirements

Rosa – Questions on glass. What is it that you want to put in the building?

Mike - By Acme zoning ordinance it is non-reflective transparent glass. We proposed opaque glass as up to 20% of advertising is on glass. They don't see benefit for glass window shopping. Unless we wanted to go through an appeal process, we decided to follow the code due to contractual time frame. They don't see benefit of window shopping for their type of operation.

Rosa – benefit to having things in one store similar to others within the store

J Jocks – With respect to legal concerns. Hasn't been part of this review and quickly looked over packet. Tends to agree a site plan review doesn't give the opportunity of the planning commission to approve with aesthetic type conditions mandates. Does not see that awnings can be demanded based on ordinance. Has not really reviewed entire ordinance but doesn't feel awnings can be required. With respect to porous asphalt, Gosling says stormwater basins design meets the ordinance and is satisfactory. John I's review stated site plan did not include LID technologies and applicant would have to address why LID technologies would not be used. Presumes stormwater meets ordinance requirements based on Gosling review. I don't necessarily know because I have not had time to review but if plan meets it, it meets it. Appears there is a newer date on site plan.

Crain – Revisions to plan addressed lighting, bike rack and plantings. Nothing has changed on stormwater.

Jocks – If Bob's (Gosling Czubak) review says it meets the ordinance than it meets it. With respect to what happens behind the glass I think you should shy away from any requirements where stuff is stored inside. Maybe change to zoning ordinance with respect to street views.

Pete - Ordinance is 7.5.4 b5. Seems to say it should be asphalt, by you may allow porous asphalt.

Feringa – In my experience porous pavement is a good product but doesn't bode well in northern Michigan. Has to be maintained. If it gets clogged, during thaw and freeze cycle concerned as it could ice over the porous condition and cause runoff. It is a small site so doesn't know how effective porous

asphalt would be and thinks the retention basin would handle flows better. Want this to work properly. Engineer says it meets our ordinance requirements. Any plantings or rain gardens in front are going to have issues due to use of basin for snow storage

Demarsh - Asked about discussions with John I regarding defending position on the conditions in the review on porous pavement on 9 spaces in the back.

Feringa – I did not. First time I saw it when I came in. I don't think we talked about that previously.

Lennox – No that is correct. We didn't at last meeting.

Feringa – There is a suggested motion in packet. Doesn't think awnings can be required. Site may not be a good candidate for porous asphalt because it is such a small site, and as far as what goes on behind windows is not part of a site plan review.

Jocks – Suggests in motion that you incorporate 1-5 of suggested motion provided by John I.

Rachael Babcock – Speed will be coming down in near future so that will change things with respect to building.

Feringa – And the options about light fixtures

Timmins – Are there any differences in how they illuminate..

Mike – downward lighting for all of items.

Timmins – would you be opposed to putting plantings on rear of retention basin down lower from trees. Specific to water filtration.

Crain – they are designed to be a dry basin.

Timmins- they are meant for taking up water and cleaning

Crain – at this time we have submitted our plan

Sign on 72 will not be red background but rather beige-cream color.

### **Rosa – Motion to**

Approve the site plan submitted by Acme 72, LLC for the construction of a 6,912 square foot Advance Auto store located on a .77 acre parcel located on M-72 with the following stipulations:

1) The approved site plan consists of eight (8) sheets with a date to be written in the lower right corner under the sheet title (i.e. C1.1) by the Chairperson of the Planning Commission.

(a) Sheet C1 – Site Plan, dated 12-01-2014

(b) Sheet C1.A – Existing Conditions, dated 12-01-2014

(c) Sheet C2 – Demolition Plan, dated 12-01-2014

(d) Sheet C3 – Grading, dated 12-01-2014

(e) Sheet C4 – Site Details, dated 12-01-2014

(f) Sheet C5 – Site Details, dated 12-01-2014

(g) Sheet C6 – Landscaping, dated 12-01-2014

(h) Sheet PH-1 – Photometrics, dated 12-01-2014

2) The approved site plan package be signed by the Chairperson of the Planning Commission and the Applicant, or their representative.

3) That a favorable review from Grand Traverse MESA (Fire) be completed prior to the issuance of a Land Use Permit.

4) The freestanding sign shall meet the Acme Township Zoning Ordinance specifically the US-31 / M-72 Business District sign provisions regarding height.

5) Landscaping materials will use only plant materials (trees and shrubs) specified in the “Recommended Planting Guidelines for Municipalities,” as published by the Northwest Michigan Invasive Species Network.

6) Lighting shall be downward facing cylindrical white LED lights

**second by Binkley. None opposed. Motion carried**

**K. PUBLIC COMMENT & OTHER PC BUSINESS 8:53pm**

Eric Takayama – From my experience in working with development, from Lautner Road to Bayview Inn will be your downtown corridor and will be inundated with proposals such as this. Acme is new hotspot. I thought ordinance when I was on the board gave right to change appearance and/or require architectural change. I thought you had more power to enforce things like awnings. Look at Division that used to be buffalo field. Built with franchise look. Not it is cycling because market is changing and old buildings are getting ripped out. Think about how you want your township to look as it becomes to look like the corner of Division. You could go rubber stamp everything. Believe you have more power to get architectural look you desire.

Closed at 8:57pm

- 1. Zoning Administrator update on projects:** Redwoods coming back; electronic signage coming; would like to bring up to discussion on gas stations; Jocks – digital signage would now be prohibitive by ordinance. Perhaps some tweaks need to be made to the FBC to have some stronger language .
- 2. Planning Consultant:**
- 3. P C Education etc.:** Forgette presented Acme Township with the placemaking award he accepted on behalf of the Planning Commission from the GT County Chapter of Michigan Township s Association and GTC Plannning Commission . The award was for the “Acme Shores: A Placemaking Strategy for the US-31 Shoreline Corridor”

**ADJOURN:**

**Motion to adjourn Beth; second Timmons. Motion carried**

**9:05 pm**