



**DRAFT UNAPPROVED**

**ACME TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**Acme Township Hall**  
**6042 Acme Road, Williamsburg, Michigan**  
**7:00 p.m. Monday, September 24, 2007**

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

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

**Members excused:** None

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

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

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

- 1. Consent Calendar:**  
Motion by Kladder, support by Carstens to approve the Consent Calendar as presented, including:

**Receive and File:**

- a) Draft Unapproved Minutes of:
  1. 09/04/07 Regular Board of Trustees Meeting
  2. 09/12/07 Shoreline Advisory meeting
  3. 09/12/07 Special Board meeting
  4. 09/18/07 Infrastructure Advisory meeting

**Action:**

- b) Approve minutes of the 08/27/07 regular Commission meeting.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

- 2. Correspondence:** Announcement of 10/17/07 Grand Vision Planning Workshop: Received and filed.

- 3. Limited Public Comment:**

Chuck Walter, Bates Road asked that the Chair consider instructing any township attorney present to be available to answer questions but not to issue statements on behalf of the township, feeling that the Chair can represent the township well.

- 4. Preliminary Hearings:**

- a) Preliminary hearing on Special-use permit/Site Plan Application #2007-06P, a Major Amendment to the LochenHeath open-space development (the files for this application are extensive! To make it more efficient for internet users to download, the link above will take you to the Table of Contents. Links in the Table of Contents will take you to the various sections of the application.)

Ken Ockert and Dusty Christensen from R. Clark Associates and Troy Molby from Gourdie Fraser Associates presented the application. They provided a PowerPoint presentation. The Open Space Development (OSD) portion of LochenHeath was first approved in 2004. Most of the 409 units are proposed to be single-family, with some "cottage" and condominium-style. The plan was amended in 2005 to reconfigure the

## DRAFT UNAPPROVED

lots and 2006 to introduce additional price points for the housing, including relocation of two golf holds and reconfiguration of the internal lake system. In 2007 they sought an additional minor amendment again relocate the golf holes to permit additional residential units to be immediately adjacent to them. They are now requesting a major amendment to the OSD.

One change would occur to the acreage; six total acres would be added and nearly nine acres removed, for a new acreage of approximately 350 acres. The current application would approve 100 units of construction on the northwest portion of the site in addition to the existing concept lots. Some units would be duplexed. The road and lake layouts would be similar to those existing. Lakeside units in the southwest corner of the OSD would be somewhat reduced from 215 to 130 single family lots. Cottage condominiums would go from 83 to 118. 148 duplex units in 74 structures would be allowed. 100 of the 111 “parked” density units for future allocation would be used up. Total OSD dwelling units would change from 409 to 407. A recreational facility would remain as contemplated in the original plan.

Specific building envelopes have been proposed to control precise placement of single-family cottage condominiums, with three building plans being offered. The owner would own the structure, with the rest of the land being common area owned by the condominium association. Home sizes range from 1,700 to 2,400 sq. ft. on single-story structures with a walkout option depending on location grade.

The OSD requires 50% open space; the plan provides for 56% open space. Golf holes are not included as open space because the zoning ordinance prohibits it. Lakes are included as open space. There would be 195 acres of open space out of 348 total acres net of land in the Dock Road right-of-way.

Mr. Molby displayed and discussed the proposed drainage and utility plans. There are five distinct drainage districts on the west half of the project that funnel flows from higher lakes through lower lakes and ultimately into the county road drainage and wetlands on the southwest corner of the property. The plan has been submitted to the County Drain Commissioner and no questions have yet been raised. Tribal water and township municipal sanitary sewer mains will run along with road rights-of-way. There is ample capacity in the sanitary system for several phases of the development, although full buildout will require capacity enhancements.

OSD Phases I and II have already been approved and are under construction. Phase 2A was relocation of the golf holes, Phase 3 is the housing between the golf holes, Phase 4 is the southerly-mid-section of the site, and Phase 5 is the southwest corner of the site.

Hull noted that the decision at hand this evening is whether or not the application is complete enough to go to public hearing.

David noted that this portion of LochenHeath was approved pursuant to the Open Space Development ordinance. He believes the applicant was allowed to include lakes and such as open space, but that under proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment 138, would this be the case? Hull noted a difference between using a lake to calculate allowable units and allowing a lake to be within an open space set-aside. He stated he would need to review the proposed ordinance in more detail to provide a more complete answer.

David observed that the proposed total number of units would drop from 409 to 407

and asked if this includes all of the duplexed units; Mr. Ockert replied that it does. Many of the duplex units come from 111 “banked” units that had not been sited previously.

Yamaguchi asked about the drainage in the southwest corner of the property, and asked what happens when it reaches Dock Road. Mr. Molby replied that an existing drainage easement there and in Peaceful Valley would carry flows ultimately to East Bay. Wikle asked if the existing easement would be cleaned out; she says it has been filling in and people have built bridges over it. This easement is part of a county drainage district, and it is their responsibility to maintain. Wikle asked about the lake elevations relative to one another; the lakes and the entire property slope towards the west.

Carstens asked if the water going into the roadside drainage ditch is filtered. Mr. Molby stated that it comes from the lakes which can hold 100 year storms and then slow-release the water. There is a pretreatment system that settles out debris before the water moves on. Mr. Molby asserted that this plan is better than multiple retention basins that will provide a longer water treatment chain prior to release into the environment. Yamaguchi asked if the pretreatment will deal with fertilizers; it will not remove nutrients from the water.

Carstens asked Grant what aspects of the situation are already approved and what are available to the township to address. Mr. Grant has not personally fully reviewed the application or prior approvals and would like to do so prior to responding. Carstens wants to be certain the application is appropriately processed, and recalls that when the project was first approved there were concerns from existing surrounding developments about additional stormwater runoff. He believes those concerns were satisfied at that time. He is concerned about proposed stormwater discharge to the road and the bay, but doesn't understand if he is able to ask detailed questions about this facet at this time. Grant stated that this is a major SUP amendment, and is subject to the full range of review and deliberation as an original application. Carstens also would prefer to have an impact assessment prepared or reviewed by a third, impartial party rather than just the applicant. Vermetten has been aware of and involved in many of the minor amendments that have occurred, and suggested that additional third party impact assessments relative to drainage issues that were discussed during original approval would be inappropriate. Mr. Molby stated that the drainage plan for Phase II was reviewed by a Grand Rapids firm, which found that the 25-year stormwater management requirements were well exceeded by their plan.

Wikle recalls being cautioned against reviewing some of the current phases during prior phases; that only the east side of the property was discussed in detail. This is the first time she believes detail of the west side of the project has been discussed. Hull stated that Wikle is recalling site plan review for earlier phases, and that site plan review for these phases will receive equally detailed treatment as they are presented. The reconfiguration of all the future phases is being presented in concept at this time.

**Motion by Krause, support by Hardin to set a public hearing for application #2007-6P. Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.**

**5. Public Hearings:**

- a) **Public hearing on SUP/Site Plan Application #2007-05P, a planned shopping center located on E M-72 west of Bates Road:** Doug Mansfield from Mansfield & Associates presented the application. He began with a general overview of the site and its context in the larger community. The property is zoned B-3, Planned

**DRAFT UNAPPROVED**

Shopping Center and R-1MH, Mobile Home and is adjacent and near to B-4 industrially-zoned properties.

MDOT has met with them regarding the project, and has asked that they work to connect the project to an access point on Bates Road. The property is divided by a rail corridor owned by MDOT and on a long-term lease to a railroad company. MDOT supports a track crossing to the south portion of the property; the lease holder does not. They have one rail customer immediately to the east of the subject parcel. Acceleration and deceleration lanes for M-72 were discussed and feedback provided. At buildout MDOT would examine to see if the warrants for placement of a traffic signal at M-72 and Bates are met.

Mr. Mansfield displayed the proposed signage feature on M-72, which looks like a train station clock tower and would be joined to a bus stop shelter. Next into the site would be 22,000 sq. ft. small retail space building, again styled like a railroad station. A boulevard would lead south into the property, and extending from it would be an easement to the TART system for a trailhead, parking area, pavilion and rest room facility. At the end of the boulevard would be three larger buildings (2 50,000 sq. ft. stores and a 150,000 sq. ft. store) with parking on a hilltop with 100' – 200' of buffer of natural vegetation. They are asking for a reduction of 1,000 parking spaces and about 60 loading docks from the ordinance standards. There are sidewalks and pedestrian walkways dividing parking aisles, and landscaped islands throughout.

Stormwater would be collected through pipes and basins leading to three sets of oil separators and sedimentation systems leading to a chain of basins for slowing and settling. Plant materials would help to further treat the water before it reaches a rain garden and ultimately the wetlands existing on the site. The treatment chain is supposed to be an innovative method of handling 25-year storm levels.

The applicant plans to install a well field and water storage tank to DPW standards in the hopes it would be accepted by the township as a public system to serve commercial, residential and fire suppression water needs. They are investigating two options for sanitary service; connection to the regional sanitary sewer system east near Lautner Road (they understand there are issues with line and pump capacity, and to contribute towards those costs). They have also talked to the Tribe about available capacity at their Turtle Creek treatment plant. David was surprised to hear this.

Approximately 70% of the site would remain in pervious open space; they are not seeking major wetlands remediation. Approximately 50% of the site would be completely undisturbed by construction.

Mr. Mansfield presented the proposed lighting plan. He stated that the firm Crites Tidey, which helped prepare it, is holding lighting seminar to include leading PhDs in the field soon. Red dots are areas where there would be no light impact from site lighting. The plan uses 20' tall light poles. They have also proposed a plan with 1/3 less fixtures that would allow a lens to project 1.5" below the bottom of the light fixture but might still meet dark sky requirements. They would be happy to present the theory to the Planning Commission if desired.

Mr. Mansfield stated receiving a mixed message about preparation of the market study at the last meeting. He believes he was told not to look at all of the other proposed developments in the township and had one prepared accordingly, but will revised as needed. A representative of his firm met with Krause to discuss the landscaping plan. Carstens had wanted to walk the site, including following the creek

through an adjacent property, but the adjacent property owner asked him to wait until after they could speak, possibly this evening.

Mr. Mansfield stated that this morning he met with the DevelopMentor panel from New Designs for Growth. They had concerns about parking fronting on M-72, traffic issues and perhaps provisions for mixed uses. He said that the B-3 ordinance does not allow for mixed uses; the Mixed Use Development Ordinance would cover that.

Hull stated that he has met with township counsel to ensure that the township is handling similar applications consistently. Counsel has recommended that the township bring in an outside planner to assist with review of this project, since this has occurred before. Hull has contacted John Iacoangeli, from Beckett Raeder to see if he would be willing, since he reviewed another recent B-3 application on the township's behalf from an independent perspective. He suggested that the Commission make a recommendation to the Board that they consider hiring him. Grant stated that it would be appropriate for the township to bring in an independent consultant to be consistent with the treatment of other similar applications. It might be desirable for the consultant to subcontract with specialists in various areas such as market studies, traffic and environmental issues. It would be paid for through the township's fee escrow policy by the applicant.

**The Chair declared a brief recess from 8:07 to 8:14 p.m.**

The Commission took a moment to review the township's fee schedule and escrow policy to see what they say about obtaining outside professional assistance. The Board would be the body which would enter into a contract; the Commission could ask the Board to consider the question. Vermetten stated having respect for Mr. Iacoangeli, but he does not feel that the township should necessarily focus only on him as a choice for the consultant. There are many other firms locally or regionally that could ably assist, and perhaps there should be a bid and interview process the Commission should undertake.

**Motion by Carstens, support by David, to recommend that the Board of Trustees consider contracting with an independent planning consultant to assist in review of the Bates Crossing SUP Application. #2007-05P.**

Carstens is specifically asking for a consultant but not for a specific consultant or process. Krause supported this approach.

**Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.**

**Public Hearing opened at 8:19 p.m.**

Gene Veliquette, 8369 Elk Lake Road, stated unawareness of ordinance requirements for how large a storm a stormwater system should be prepared. One application tonight is preparing for a 100-years storm and one is preparing for a 25-year storm, and he is curious about this. He also is uncertain about the idea of hiring an outside consultant to assist with project review, potentially at great expense. To treat them equally to Meijer might, in his opinion, to be treating everyone badly.

Mr. Walter stated that he has heard no discussion of the market study, which was apparently provided this evening. Now that a court ruling has reinstated the Village at Grand Traverse project, it seems that it should be taken into consideration along with talking to the Tribe about their potential plans. Vermetten noted that last month he

## **DRAFT UNAPPROVED**

felt the market study should not take into account anything beyond the project itself, and many others disagreed with him.

Ken Engle, Yuba Road, stated that a traffic problem exists in Bates, partly because the intersection is not square, and there is a railway crossing, there is an industrial park with heavy truck traffic. Traffic needs to be addressed properly from the outset.

Gayle Hanna, 3000 Mt. Vernon Drive, Midland owns property on Deepwater Pointe Road. She asked for the maximum height requirements in the ordinance and for the height of the buildings as proposed. Mr. Mansfield noted that the height limitation is 35', and ornamental appurtenances may be taller. The proposed building heights are 25' with the ornamental towers at 45'. Mrs. Hanna also asked about handicapped parking; Mr. Mansfield stated that the correct number of spaces are depicted on the plan. Mrs. Hanna asked if the Fire Department has reviewed the site plan or if they will for appropriate emergency access. Mr. Mansfield stated that Brian Belcher at Fire Prevention is reviewing the plans.

Dave Wiley, Bates Road, noted that the traffic study must include the impact of the five-week horse show on Bates Road. There was a real problem this summer.

Phyllis Johnson, Bates Road supported the plan but is concerned about whether the area can support a town center, Meijer and this plan as well. If not all can be accommodated, she'd prefer the town center and Meijer, Inc.

Paul Brink, Winter Road, asked for the location of Yuba Creek to be displayed and whether an environmental study has been ordered. Mr. Mansfield pointed out the headwaters of the creek as being between the subject property and the property immediately to the west. He stated the creek presence is stronger north of the property.

Andy Andres, Traverse City stated that lot of information has been presented. If a consultant is brought in, will there be additional opportunities for public review of the information and further comment. Vermetten stated there would be.

### **Public Hearing closed at 8:30 p.m.**

Carstens felt that his motion implied that market feasibility, environmental and traffic studies should be done. Vermetten felt the motion was only dealing with hiring an outside planner to assist the township with review. Carstens would like the Board to consider whether these three studies are needed. Krause felt that the consulting planner would assess the need and make a recommendation to the township as part of their task. Vermetten noted that if any wetlands on the site are to be impacted the DEQ and the County would require studies and permits. Many checks and balances are in place. He has heard nothing to make him suspect that there are such issues on this site, and he has extensive personal experience in this regard. Hull noted a letter received from Concerned Citizens of Acme Township (CCAT) that seems to indicate that they have involved an environmental consultant already and have reason to believe the matter needs to be investigated further. One reason for suggesting that Mr. Iacoangeli be hired again is that he has the resources to do this in-house. Mr. Mansfield stated that he has provided everything outlined in the zoning ordinance. The Commission may ask for additional information to assist their decision-making process. If there are questions, he would appreciate the opportunity to see if there is a simple or non-controversial answer his firm can provide before the matter is taken to an extensive and potentially expensive review process. David stated that he does not

intend to question Mr. Mansfield's firm's integrity, but it is true that their goals and the township's may differ. Carstens agrees that the applicant should not be asked to "throw money away," and he feels an expert eye as to potential issues is desirable. He has suspicions about the location of the headwaters but no certainty, and wants to know how close the water table is to the surface throughout the property. Carstens suggested having the Infrastructure Advisory look into the matter if this is within their realm of discussion. Hull stated that the point of having an outside consultant perform a review is to have these questions answered. Protecting the environment is one condition of granting an SUP so it would be one thing they would address. Kladder expressed an understanding that one point of the idea is to ensure that all developers are treated the same. Hull stated that the previous shopping center application did not include definition of the specific land uses to be included in the project. This made it impossible to judge the traffic impacts, so one condition of the SUP that was granted was further SUP review for each use so traffic impacts could be fully assessed. Hull stated that this applicant also needs to define the uses for their proposed spaces, and if they cannot their permit should contain identical language. Kladder believes that if a consultant hired sees a need for additional detailed studies, they will let the township know. Vermetten feels that having one entity manage the whole process, rather than multiple contractors, would be a good idea. David feels it would be beneficial to understand what sort of precedent is being set. It may not be necessary to hire consultants to help review every project, but we do need to hire extra assistance when appropriate to answer particular questions. Grant agreed. The township should treat applicants for similar permits similarly. This is a planned shopping center application that seems similar to the Meijer application. It may or may not be sized similarly, but it generates traffic questions, and perhaps environmental questions. He believes the applications are similar enough that, as with the Meijer application, consultant assistance is appropriate and consistent with past practice.

Hardin asked about project phasing. Mr. Mansfield stated that the answer depends on when the project is approved. In general they would start with the "neighborhood retail" building near M-72, then proceed to the largest store and finally construct the junior anchors.

Vermetten appreciates that the township relies on many local, regional and state agencies to provide feedback on technical details of applications. The ordinance discusses in general terms some of the types of information required of a complete application.

David noted that at the last meeting there was discussion about having parking between the neighborhood retail building and M-72 and whether it should be relocated behind the building to conform to the ordinance. He had felt the plan would be amended before being presented again. Mr. Mansfield states that the ordinance requires parking to be set back at least 50' from the M-72 right-of-way. He wanted to receive feedback from MDOT prior to looking at the parking configuration. He also received similar concerns about the parking from the DevelopMentor group, which is made up of a variety of business perspectives. They may suggest that some parking be between the building and the road and some behind the road, so that people can at least see that there is parking and try to determine whether the stores are open. Also, if access is primarily from Bates Road rather than from M72, the definition of "front" for the project changes entirely and the parking would be behind the store already. Hull stated that the parking section of the ordinance requires parking to be side or rear yards, but also gives the Commission the ability to waive the requirement. He received a letter from MDOT today; one thing they want the

township to bear in mind as a planning goal is that in the future an M-72 boulevard would be desirable. This would require acquisition of right-of-way. The way the site is set up now, the parking area could be acquired for road expansion rather than having to relocate a building, which would be more difficult. Mr. Mansfield pointed out supplemental regulations for the M-72 corridor in the zoning ordinance from which he derived the ability to place the parking between the road and the building.

**Motion by Carstens, support by Yamaguchi to continue the public hearing on SUP Application #2007-05P**

**6. New Business:**

- a) **Request by Immanuel, LLC to amend the Zoning Ordinance to extend the sewer district to include the Bates Crossing (application):** Hull asked what information might be helpful to the Commission in evaluating this question. The Infrastructure Advisory is discussing the matter and may be for several meetings in an attempt to provide input to the Commission for a decision. Hardin believes that between LochenHeath, the Village and this proposed project there could be a system capacity issue. Where are there potential problems? Hull understands that the pump station that would ultimately serve this project may have capacity issues. There may or may not be other issues. Carstens believes from a planning and environmental perspective that if the project is to be built, someone should be serving it with sanitary service to protect the environment. Krause noted that the master plan does not call for expansion of the sewer district, and he quoted the relevant passages. Vermetten agrees that natural resources should be protected, and if there will be a pod of development in the Bates area according to the future land use map and the zoning ordinance there should be infrastructure. He also agrees with Krause that expansion of infrastructure can create unwanted sprawl. Kladder noted that the proposed development would be about 271,000 sq. ft., and wondered how much square footage there is in existing industrial buildings. Hull noted that industrial buildings may not create much sanitary waste; Vermetten wonders if retail spaces would generate all that much either. Vermetten is looking forward to more information from the Infrastructure Advisory. David hopes that the advisory will keep in mind the dictates of the Master Plan, and consider that perhaps if an infrastructure connection is denied the project would not be built. Vreeland mentioned that whether sanitary systems are regional or on-site, they can be provided and allow the project to move forward according to the zoning. White took exception to David's statements, feeling that they indicated a desire to prevent any development in the township. Vermetten observed that knowing the type of tenancy will affect traffic and infrastructure needs.

Wikle asked Steve Feringa from the GT Band for a statement about their facilities; Mr. Feringa stated that there are no plans to expand sewer service from Turtle Creek along M-72 at this time.

- b) **Staff request to initiate budgeted amendments to Zoning Ordinance: bring into compliance with changes in statutes:** Hull reported that in 2006 the state adopted a new Zoning Enabling Act. Townships are not required to amend their ordinances to comply as long as they behave in a compliant manner; however it seems prudent to amend the ordinances to be consistent with current enabling acts. Revision of the Sign Ordinance would be desirable, and ensuring that the stand-alone Sexually Oriented Business ordinance is up to current standards would be desirable as well. The current budget provides for work in this regard, and he is asking if the Planning Commission is prepared to move forward at this time. The first step would be legal issues that would not change the character of the land use regulations. Yamaguchi would like to see a priority list for policy amendments; Hull has one already. The Wireless Services Ordinance needs to be on that list, fairly high up. Township legal counsel will help with the amendment of a

specifically legal nature to comply with the Zoning Enabling Act. The Commission reached consensus to proceed.

- c) **Chairman’s discussion of Amendment 138, Development Options**: Vermetten stated that he has heard a lot of disinformation about the proposed Ordinance amendment that is of a divisive nature. He sat on his porch with a petition circulator who told him about the evils of the ordinance but, it turned out, had never read it and didn’t know he was speaking to the Planning Commission Chair. Perhaps it is the fault of the Planning Commission that it has not better educated the public, and they don’t understand that there are other development options that remain unchanged in the ordinance along with the alternatives the proposed ordinance provides. After additional extensive review of the development options in the proposed Ordinance and discussion with legal counsel he still believes that the Commission did what it set out to do. Vermetten would like to assemble Hull, Mr. Iacoangeli and legal counsel for a special meeting to attempt to better inform the public as to what the ordinance is and is not. He likes Kladder’s statement about remembering that the “loyal opposition are our neighbors.” It would not be a marketing effort; if people still walk away disagreeing that’s okay as long as they are well and appropriately informed. Hardin appreciated the suggestion. Kladder asked if there could be a difficulty with respecting the boundary between informing and advocating, the latter being inappropriate in terms of the upcoming referendum. Grant will advise the township accordingly. Carstens received a mailing opposing the ordinances that he felt was very inaccurate and angered him. He supports Vermetten’s idea as well. Vermetten agreed that the point is not to advocate but to lay out the facts for public consumption. Carstens believes that the township should also continue to look at options from members of the farming community that might be beneficial to the preservation of agricultural pursuits in the community. He would appreciate receiving feedback from the farming community that he can consider and receive feedback about from other experts; it’s an ongoing process. Vermetten noted that this ordinance does not pertain only to the farming community, but to all land in the community. Krause asked why Mr. Iacoangeli would be involved; he helped draft the ordinances. Krause ascertained that we would not be asking Mr. Iacoangeli to try to revise the proposed ordinances. Yamaguchi also received the opposition mailing and found it to be inaccurate, and agrees that the opportunity for additional public education would be a good idea. With consensus, Vermetten would work with staff to schedule the meeting expeditiously.

7. **Old Business:** None.

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

Noelle Knopf, 5795 US 31 N asked if the public would be able to ask questions during an informational meeting about proposed Ordinance 138. They will; the meeting simply would not be a formal public hearing. Ms. Knopf feels David asked a very important question about LochenHeath relative to Ordinance 138 that was not answered: would their application be valid in light of the proposed ordinance?

Mr. Gene Veliquette said he does not appreciate an implication that the people who oppose the ordinance are ignorant. He cited several sections of the proposed new ordinance that he believes deviate significantly from the existing ordinance in an extraordinarily detrimental way for landowners. When Mr. Iacoangeli arrives he should be asked to evaluate how different LochenHeath would be if developed under Ordinance 138. Under Ordinance 138 would it be possible to develop the Pulcipher orchards if you can’t develop near roads, along ridgelines or in orchards?

Eugene LaLone pointed to the Planning Commission table, imagining it to be the township. He imagined development all along the township, asking what type of development it might

be, and whether it's good for the community.

Nels Veliquette stated that Dr. Soji Adelaja from the MSU Land Policy Institute will be here on October 4 at noon for a discussion and all are invited to attend. He is here to look at the agricultural impact of the NW Michigan fruit belt.

Mr. Andres had a discussion about a week ago with Kladder about the visioning process. He feels that there has been no comprehensive vision established for the M-72 corridor and that one needs to be established soon. Sprawl and development rights are pressing issues. It's time to more fully understand "new urbanism" and "visioning."

David asked Hull for a status update on the possible joint planning district with Whitewater Township. Hull reported that we are waiting on Whitewater Township to evaluate their desire to participate.

David also asked about changing the configuration of the room back to the other orientation.

Carstens stated that in the past the Planning Commission prepared a proposed M-72 Corridor overlay district ordinance, but the draft they prepared was turned down by the Board of Trustees. He appreciates the need to have one.

**Meeting adjourned at 9:29 p.m.**