

FINAL
CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF COMMERCE
***SPECIAL* PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

Monday, August 7, 2023
2009 Township Drive
Commerce Township, Michigan 48390

A. CALL TO ORDER: Chairperson Parel called the meeting to order at 5:30pm.

ROLL CALL: Present:

Brian Parel, Chairperson
Bill McKeever
George Weber
Joe Loskill
Brady Phillips (arrived at 5:37pm)

Absent:

Sam Karim (excused)
Brian Winkler, Vice Chairperson (excused)

Also Present:

Dave Campbell, Township Planning Director
Paula Lankford, Planner
Julia Upfal, Planner, Giffels Webster
Rose Kim, Staff Planner, Giffels Webster

B. APPROVAL OF THE SPECIAL MEETING AGENDA

MOTION by Loskill, supported by McKeever, to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Agenda of August 7, 2023, as presented.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

C. MASTER LAND USE PLAN REVIEW

Work session of the 2015 Master Land Use Plan update

Rose Kim – Today, we’re going to start with a short recap of the recent Open House, and then we’ll go over our implementation chapter and discuss some action items that would be supporting our goals and objectives for the plan. Then we will wrap up with our next steps and what we expect for the next couple of months.

To preface everything, in your packets we included a full working draft. We wanted to give you a tangible sense of where the document is. There are still some pieces that we are going to be working through over the next month in terms of the more substantial elements and refining those, but we will use this session to really establish what’s going to bring us forward.

For the second Open House, it was very much in alignment with what we’ve gone over with you before, and a lot of the public input that we’ve received to this point. Residents who were here, and also those who responded online, agreed upon the following items:

- Connections are really important in the Township
- Preservation of natural features
- Making sure that residents have access to open space
- Improving transportation and pedestrian safety
- In terms of uses, seeing more pedestrian-oriented uses
- There was consensus and satisfaction with recommendations for our area plan sites

We did not end up featuring the future land use station that we had set up here as part of the online Open House, so we did not necessarily receive a lot of direct comments

related to the proposed changes. However, I think with the changes that we have, which are mostly getting future land uses in alignment with zoning, we were not particularly concerned about seeing any opposition to those changes.

We also had a couple of supplemental activities on our project website. One was focused on nonmotorized transportation, and again, a lot of that feedback was concerned about getting more connections and connecting specifically destinations, community facilities and parks for residents.

We have that portion of the public input within the plan. The summary is in the first portion of the plan, but if you're interested in looking at specific comments, those can be found in the appendix.

Weber – So what do you want to accomplish today?

Rose Kim – That was just a summary of the public input. Today, we'd like to go over the action items, along with anything that you might feel is unresolved or that you'd like to discuss further.

Julia Upfal – I was going to lead us through that part of the discussion.

Weber – I did go through the Plan, and I've got some comments and questions. So, we are starting with the action items and then we will get into the details.

Julia Upfal – Yes. So, the action plan is the implementation section of the Master Plan. It's the part of the plan that goes to work, so to speak. There are three different classifications for all of the action items in here. There are zoning items, advocacy items and capital improvements. There are also some other items that don't really fit well into any of those boxes.

Zoning items are recommendations for further study for potential zoning ordinance amendments, or changes to the zoning map. Advocacy items are items that are asking other groups or organizations, looking to other resources to meet the Township's goals. Capital improvements are items that have a capital expense along with them.

The one thing about zoning strategies that I want to make sure we make not of is that these are recommendations to have further exploration. We're not talking about the specific standards, district designations or the nitty gritty of those zoning changes. That is going to happen when you actually go to amend the Zoning Ordinance. At this point, it's just really advisory that the Planning Commission should explore those items further and look to see if an amendment is appropriate.

These action items are a key component of the plan that the Planning Commission hasn't seen yet, even though it is in the full Master Plan document that is before you today. As Rose said, we're going to be accepting feedback from the Planning Commission. I'll explain more of that in a bit, but during that time, take a close look at these action items and we can talk about which ones really resonate, and which ones represent actions that are not in alignment with the goals and the vision laid out.

The three key questions I had in the memo for this meeting are:

1. Are there any action items proposed that you feel should be removed?
2. Are there any action items that you would like to see rephrased or reworded?
3. Are there any action items that you feel should be added to the list?

Those are the three key questions to consider as you go through the action items and provide feedback.

There are asterisks next to action items that are adapted from the previous Master Plan, or from the Parks & Recreation Plan. The language may not be 1:1, but it's helping the Planning Commission understand where the action came from. If it's no longer relevant, that is helpful information, so take a careful look at those asterisked items.

For the Master Plan, and we will talk momentarily about the feedback the Planning Commission has so far, but this is the first draft. There are opportunities for feedback tonight, but then we're also going to make revisions based on tonight's meeting and have a new draft turned over to you by the following Monday, the 14th. The Planning Commission will be given two weeks to provide any written comments or feedback, and that can be done either through a cloud-based Adobe Reader, or through handwritten notes. If you write notes on a few pages, we ask that you flag those pages or remove them from the plan and give us only the pages with notes.

If we find that the revisions discussed tonight are minor in nature, and also from the feedback process, our goal is to have a refined draft by the September 11th meeting. There is a September 12th Township Board meeting. At that time, the Planning Commission may wish to open the plan up for the 60-day public comment period, upon approval by the Township Board at their meeting on September 12th. This would require that the Township Board sees the plan in their packet at the same time that the Planning Commission does.

If the Planning Commission or administration would rather delay that timeline, that would put things back another month. With the September 11th Planning Commission and September 12th Township Board, and the 60-day public comment period, as required by statute, that sets us up for adoption in December. Alternatively, if it went to the Board in October, it would be a January adoption.

Weber – Depending on what we accomplish tonight, then we can see how extensive revisions might be and that might help us make that decision. Dave and Paula, I don't know what you think.

Dave Campbell – So Julia and Rose, you would be getting the Planning Commission and staff a revised draft a week from today?

Julia Upfal – Yes, just with tonight's feedback.

Dave Campbell – Right, then two weeks to accept comments, which takes us to...

Julia Upfal – The end of August or say September 1st.

Dave Campbell – Then you incorporate those comments into a draft that the Planning Commission would see on the 11th, and the Township Board would see it on the 12th. And hopefully that would be the draft that would go out for distribution.

Julia Upfal – Yes, we are fortunate that we have that extra week because of Labor Day where we can turn around the revisions.

Weber – I'm not sure that's going to work, meaning that the Board would get the draft in their packet that hasn't been finalized by the Planning Commission.

Dave Campbell – Right, because what goes to the Board for a meeting on the 12th would be included in a packet that goes out the Wednesday prior. That's the 6th.

Weber – So again, maybe if we see what we get through tonight, we might have higher confidence that it's a finished product that would go into what the Board gets. Rightfully so, the Board would not want to have something in their packet that they're going to be asked to read and approve when the Planning Commission hasn't approved it yet.

Dave Campbell – Neither body would be approving it. You would just be approving it for distribution.

Weber – Okay, I understand.

Julia Upfal – The Michigan Planning Enabling Act allows a Planning Commission to adopt a Master Plan by a two-thirds vote, or a lot of times, the Planning Commission will adopt the Master Plan, and they will also ask for a recommendation from the Township Board for final approval. Do you have a process established for how you want to get to that finish line?

Dave Campbell – Both of these predate me, but precedent is that the Planning Commission sends it to the Township Board for final approval.

Julia Upfal – I think that's generally best, then you have everybody on the same page. An alternative would be that you could hold a special meeting in December, but the caveat is that you'd need both. If you have the Plan go to Planning Commission on September 11th, and then it doesn't return to the Township Board for the open 60-days until October, then that period would end after the December Planning Commission and Township Board meetings. If you wanted to adopt the Plan in December, it would require a special meeting of both, or you could just wait until January.

Weber – Again, I think a lot might be based on tonight's discussion. If we get through the majority of this with a significant amount of consensus, then I think we would be more comfortable. I agree that we should try to knock it out in December.

Chairperson Parel – What is the worst case scenario? We get the package with our final draft the Wednesday prior to our meeting, and the Township Board also gets it. Maybe there's something that comes up in our meeting, a slight adjustment here or there ...

Weber – As long as that's all it is.

Dave Campbell – Rose and Julia, with the September 11th and 12th dynamic, the Planning Commission and the Board would not be approving the Master Plan. They would be saying that it is in a form that we feel warrants distribution to our neighboring communities.

Julia Upfal – Thank you, that's a really good point and I should have emphasized that more. It's not final approval by any means. It's simply opening it up to the public to provide comments on.

Weber – So we are just putting a draft out there, hopefully a well-defined draft.

Julia Upfal – Yes.

Dave Campbell – We're asking our neighbors, *Do you see anything?* Does that give you any comfort?

Chairperson Parel – I think we'd also be asking the Trustees the same thing at the same time.

Dave Campbell – The Trustees have to approve distribution to our neighboring communities, utility companies and everybody else. I think the intent is that both the Planning Commission and the Township Board would want to feel that it is in a state of 95% completion.

Weber – I feel more comfortable with that. This is a nearly finished draft, but it's still a draft that is going out for additional comments, and we might make revisions based upon the comments we receive, as long as what is going to the Board has negligible changes from what they saw a few days prior.

Rose Kim – And we do have an opportunity to make some minor edits and refinements after both the Planning Commission and the Board see it in September, right before it goes out to distribution.

Dave Campbell – Do you have a distribution date in front of you?

Julia Upfal – It's a 63-day public comment period, and the November Planning Commission day is the 62nd day, so you really have a good window for when you have to get it published. It's almost meets that November meeting.

Dave Campbell – What date do we need to distribute it by?

Julia Upfal – Maybe two weeks after the Township Board meeting.

Dave Campbell – So about September 25th?

Julia Upfal – Yes, you have far more than 63 days before the December Planning Commission meeting. It's probably 85 days.

Discussion took place regarding moving the date of the November Planning Commission meeting and the required publishing date to allow 63 days.

Dave Campbell – I think to Mr. Weber's point, let's see what we come up with tonight.

Julia Upfal – Okay, I want to talk about the draft in front of you and how it's structured. The existing conditions, those demographics, et cetera, are in the appendix. We want to make sure that you know, as soon as you open the plan, you're going to go right into the Master Plan guiding principles and the framework for the plan, the public input, and then into those goals and objectives. The purpose of that is because that is what people

want to see when they pick up a Master Plan; they want to see where things are going. We don't want that to be hidden. We want it at the front.

In this update, one section that you have not had the opportunity to see before is the future land use descriptions. We did go through the map, but there are also intent statements that go with each district, so I think it's important to take a careful look at each of those because when you go through a future rezoning process, you're going to look to both the map and those intent statements to determine whether or not a rezoning is appropriate.

I also want to make note that we had a lot of public input about *not wanting anymore development, no more housing, no more construction*. I think one important point is that zoning can only go so far, and people have private property rights. We tried to be respectful of that in understanding that if someone's property is zoned for residential development at this moment, we can't take that ability to develop land away from them. We want to make sure the public is aware that input is very important and definitely a consideration when making this plan, but we have to balance that with things that are up to the market and really aren't up to planning and zoning to determine.

Those are the points I wanted to make before talking through the plan. I know you haven't had much time with it, so I thought at this meeting, we would have more of an open discussion to hear any feedback that you might have at this time. We will take that into account and turn something back over by next Monday. We know when you have two weeks with the plan and the opportunity to provide written feedback, we expect to get much more in-depth comments. I'll open it up to you to share any thoughts you might have.

Chairperson Parel – Is the thought that we go through the plan and turn pages to see if there are any comments? I know George has some, and I definitely have some. Is that your intent tonight, or was your intent to go through the action items?

Julia Upfal – I feel like we couldn't go through every page of the plan in an hour. Maybe we can go through each section.

Weber – What if we went through the action plan first which starts on Page 100. If we get through that, and we have time, then we can go back to whoever had any comments on any of the other sections.

Julia Upfal – I think that's fine, but if you do have any major comments, I don't want to miss those if we don't get through this. Maybe we can go through those big key points if there are any.

Weber – I think you gave a good opening. There were two items that we heard from the residents, not just through this process. One, nobody wants anymore development, and two, traffic is horrible. Those are two things we hear frequently. I think the way you addressed it, that people do have personal property, they do have the right to sell it, and they have the right to receive the value based on the way that property is zoned, and we need to be respectful of that. Having said that, in the front of the document we recognize that development is a concern and we take it seriously. At the same time, the Board has taken the view that over 30% of Township land has been protected, either because it is a park, it's a lake, it's Township-owned property, or it's greenspace. That 30% is a combination of property the Township owns, which is over 160 parcels, in

addition to Proud Lake and the lakes. I think that is an important point to make as we're talking about development. We don't just talk about it; the Township has taken action to protect that. There aren't a lot of communities that can say 30% of their property has been protected from being overdeveloped. That's the overarching theme that I took from this. I do have some specific items, whether it's a typo or something else, that I don't think we need to go through here, but that's the point I wanted to get across.

Julia Upfal – That's really helpful.

Weber – Then we'll come back to that in the action plan where there are items that I think are contradictory to that.

Chairperson Parel – I think it definitely makes sense to put smaller points and changes in an email.

Weber – Yes.

Chairperson Parel – As far as addressing bigger issues, do you have any that you'd like to discuss?

Weber – One of the items, and this is more of a question; on Page 40, you identify that the Township explore ways to help private road improvements. I took that to mean that the Township to look at financially improving private roads, and I don't think the Township should be doing that. We have a mechanism through special assessment districts if property owners want to have their private road paved. I don't think in our Master Plan, we want to allude to the Township looking to improve private roads. Maybe I misunderstood.

Rose Kim – No, and I think we actually ended up corrected that since we sent you the draft. We removed private in that sentence.

Weber – On Page 50, the comment is made that the Township has ample land for potential commercial solar, potentially at the loss of farming. I have no idea where that came from because I'm not aware that the Township has any agricultural zoned property that we are looking to flip to solar.

Julia Upfal – I think we can agree with that. That is a battle that a lot of communities are facing, especially in Michigan, and it's certainly important to preserve those agricultural assets.

Weber – I'm guessing this came from somebody else's master plan.

Julia Upfal – That, or a carryover from the old plan.

Rose Kim – What page was that?

Julia Upfal – 50.

Weber – Under infrastructure.

Julia Upfal – I think we can get rid of that.

Weber – This is a little bit overarching, and I'll hit some of the pages, but where it speaks to housing diversity, there's no mitigation for density. This also gets hit in the action plan starting on Page 102, where language is in the document that talks about, *explore zoning amendments to allow 2 and 3-family homes in single-family neighborhoods requiring that homes are designed with features/characteristics of a single-family home and compatible with surrounding areas.*

On Page 68 where we talk about Commerce and Carey, we talk about that similar language. But the concept here that I think we're trying to get across is, it's okay to have a cluster development within a geography, meaning if it is zoned R-1A, we might allow something where the lots are significantly smaller to allow for greater greenspace within the overall parcel that's being developed; however, we would not allow any more density of homes on that property. If it's zoned R-1A, and the property says you can put 10 homes on it, rather than having ten 20,000 square foot lots, we might have ten 10,000 square foot lots, with a giant park surrounding it, but you still only get 10 homes on that parcel.

Julia Upfal – Yes, I think that was certainly our intent. I'm not sure that was conveyed, and we can emphasize that more. We do have some actions that reference clustering, but it may not be spoken of in that balance that you mentioned. When we talk about increased density, we should also talk about having that balance at the same time.

Weber – That then ties into the overarching theme. We hear the residents about development and overdevelopment, and there are ways we can still do it creatively, but we're not jamming in any more homes than a property is presently zoned for, within these potentially creative alternatives.

Julia Upfal – I like it.

Weber – Page 86, which gets into future land use categories where we are consolidating categories, for example; single-family residential, cluster residential, neighborhood residential, all being captured under neighborhood residential. I'm not smart enough to know what some unintended consequences might be from that clustering. That may be more of a question for Dave and Paula. I'm not opposed to it, I just don't know what the pros and cons are.

Julia Upfal – I think a really important point is that this is the future land use to future land use; it's not the zoning to the future land use. In those classifications, we want to eliminate cluster residential because cluster should be a tool, and it's already a tool in the ordinance. You can use it in any residential area. I think the intention when they put that in the Future Land Use Map before was to identify sites that had a lot of natural features that would be desirable for preservation. Really, we want to promote the ability to preserve open areas and create density on any residential site, so we eliminated those and consolidated them into neighborhood residential. The single-family residential is also consolidated because those aligned most with the current zoning map. The lot sizes that were recommended in the last Master Plan were consistent across the different future land use categories, so it's really not a big change although it might look like one on paper.

Dave Campbell – Are there densities associated with these designations?

Julia Upfal – No, that's one thing we eliminated because it gives the Planning Commission more flexibility in the future. It talks about the scale of density and maybe the trade area for commercial districts, or the labor supply pool area, but less so about the exact size of lots.

Weber – Page 89, you mention under multi-family residential in the Commerce Village area. I'm not sure I agree with multi-family residential there. You had it next to the hospital, and the hospital is next to the Village.

Julia Upfal – On Page 89?

Weber – Last sentence of the first paragraph, multi-family residential. I don't think we had any discussion of putting multi-family in the Commerce Village area. It says near Huron Valley Hospital.

Discussion continued regarding removal of that sentence and looking at the related map on Page 85 where multi-family is shown in orange.

Weber – All the other comments I had were in the action plan areas.

Chairperson Parel – I have a few. In your introduction on Page 14 of the document, under the planning process where it refers to the ten parcels that we recognize, and it labels them as *ripe for development*. I'm not sure I like that term as it implies we are excited for them to be developed.

Weber – Yes, imminent.

Chairperson Parel – Yes, or imminent. I think we should modify that.

Julia Upfal – Okay, likely to have potential development to occur.

Weber – Yes, something that doesn't sound like we're actively seeking. While you're on that page; where you talk about a vibrant haven for generations to come. It's not just vibrant; I wanted to add the word *fun* as well.

Chairperson Parel – Page 46, under stewardship; we talked about adding some specifics in here regarding utilizing sustainable building materials.

Julia Upfal – I think that's a great opportunity to add something. Maybe it should be added in the action plan.

Chairperson Parel – I'm okay with letting you pick where it goes.

Julia Upfal – And maybe when we talk about site improvements, we can add language about building materials too. Where it talks about, *the Township strives to adopt regulations that protect and preserve the rural environment*; we can add something

about; ... *and ensures that the built environment is developed in a way that is sustainable and will not exacerbate* ... we will wordsmith it.

Chairperson Parel – On Page 58; we have a description of Five & Main and some pictures. I don't love the fact that we're still showing the theater when a theater will never be on that property.

Julia Upfal – Do you have any other renderings? I think those are Google image search renderings that we have.

Dave Campbell – Yes, they provided up-to-date renderings that are more representative of what they want to do.

Julia Upfal – We will incorporate those into the plan. Thank you.

Chairperson Parel – On the Beaumont property, we talked about different concepts for redevelopment and what we would like to see. Although it might not be economically viable now, have we mentioned that a hospital use would also make sense on this property?

McKeever – That's what it's zoned.

Chairperson Parel – Correct, and I'm just wondering.

McKeever – I wouldn't even address it. I would leave it as is, unsaid; it's hospital. If they ask us to rezone that ...

Chairperson Parel – Well we talk about concepts for redevelopment, and we talk about potentially putting in a corporate headquarters.

Julia Upfal – I don't think it would hurt. I think we could add some language, especially since it's that corporate campus. I feel like there was a push back against a medical campus at some point, but maybe I'm incorrect. We can definitely add language to make it corporate, medical.

Chairperson Parel – I think the point Bill was trying to make is that it is currently zoned hospital. I know we may have some ideas for it in the future and that may incorporate the Willams property as well, and it may be a corporate campus or something else. But in the end, it is zoned hospital.

Julia Upfal – I think it's good to have it in the Master Plan. If they wanted to go after funding, they could say it's supported by the community's Master Plan, especially when you know that site is going to need some cleanup, so it's nice to have alignment there.

Chairperson Parel – Does anyone else have any other major items they want to discuss? If not, maybe Dave, you want to start an email? Should we just email our edits that might be of a smaller nature.

Dave Campbell – I think I heard that Giffels has a cloud-based format where comments can be sent in. How would you best receive additional comments over the two weeks?

Julia Upfal – We are going to be on pause until next Monday because we are going to make some small tweaks between now and then. Next Monday we will give you a draft and a mechanism. It is through Adobe, they have a cloud-based program where we can send a link and it's a PDF. You can leave notes on the PDF if you right click and add a comment. Also, if people are more comfortable just marking up and editing things, I know sometimes that is the easiest way to go about it. We're not opposed to collecting feedback that way, but you can just separate the marked up pages from the stack, or put post-it's on them, that would help us immensely.

Dave Campbell – You're talking about physical mark-ups with physical post-its?

Julia Upfal – If that's easier. Whatever is preferred.

Discussion continued regarding coordination on comments and incorporating changes. Julia Upfal discussed the OMA and cautioned against any communication between the Planning Commissioner's during the exchange of comments. She explained that they would not give Commissioners the ability to see or respond to each other's comments, but the changes could be highlighted once complete.

Chairperson Parel – So the next item is to go over the action items?

Julia Upfal – Yes, we can see how far we can get, but again, you will all have the opportunity to continue marking this up. They are each under a different goal, so we can go one by one, starting with residential development. It's mostly the same as the one that was in your packet, and the main modification was that we added an asterisk if it came straight from the last Master Plan. For example, under stewardship, this is one I need to ask about; is the SWPI, the Storm Water Program Initiative still something that exists to participate in? Those asterisked items are helpful. I did research but I didn't turn up anything, so it's helpful to have more eyes on these actions.

Weber – On Page 102, under residential, under objectives, the second item; *encourage cluster residential developments that preserve land for open space or recreation*. I think that should be modified with a statement; *density will not be approved above existing zoning requirements*, or something similar to that.

Then I've got a very similar theme under Z3, Z4 and Z6, specifically as it relates to multi-family. Again, the concept of density. I'm not sure I remember a discussion where we would allow residential as part of B-1 and B-2 zoning. I don't think that we would want to provide a developer an opportunity to say, *I want to change this business into an apartment building because your Master Plan says we can put apartment buildings on B-1 and B-2*. I know that's not the intent here. It's a mixed-use development, but that's not what it says.

Julia Upfal – It does, it says *to allow residential as part of a mix of uses*.

Rose Kim – We updated that one at the end of last week.

Julia Upfal – Okay.

Weber – I still want to be clear; a mix of uses ...

Julia Upfal – In a mixed use ...

Weber – I don't want there to be any lack of clarity that we don't want an apartment building replacing something that is zoned B-1 or B-2.

Julia Upfal – But you're comfortable with a mixed-use development, correct?

Weber – Comfortable would be a strong word. I understand that you're trying to get a transition from commercial to residential, but there are very limited places within the Township where that would make sense.

Paula Lankford – In B-1, there is an allowance for a live/work mixed-use.

McKeever – Didn't we actually approve one on Commerce Road?

Paula Lankford – Yes, we did, but it never came to fruition.

Julia Upfal – But it has to be live/work, so it's not traditional?

Paula Lankford – Living on top and retail or commercial on the bottom. B-1 also allows for residential in our 2015 Master Plan. It does state in there that you can do residential in a neighborhood commercial district.

Weber – We have that in the Village, right?

Paula Lankford – No.

Weber – I think it's something we need to be careful about because somebody will latch onto language that we may not want them to latch onto.

Julia Upfal – We can be more directive and specific. I do think that part of the recommendation comes from the experience with Five & Main, understanding that to sustain a commercial development right now, it is sometimes important to have a residential component for developers. We don't want standalone residential. We want to avoid that, and we will modify that language to be clear. You also said Z6?

Loskill – Did we ever talk about additional structures on residential lots? Like grandparent homes or rental homes and things like that?

Weber – We talked about as part of this process, something about an in-laws dwelling, but I don't know if that's allowed.

Dave Campbell – Currently, our Zoning Ordinance for single-family is one dwelling per lot.

Loskill – So Z5 would not apply.

Julia Upfal – I think this is something that we haven't discussed a lot with the Planning Commission, but we did have it at the first Open House as an engagement item that we asked for feedback on. We heard positive reception toward accessory dwelling units. That being said, it is a complex thing to just add to your Zoning Ordinance, and we understand that it requires further study. The intent of this action item was just to have the Planning Commission discuss further and consider what may or may not be appropriate, and whether it is a housing type that is of interest, but not to recommend adopting them.

Dave Campbell – Julia and I discussed this. It can be a contentious issue when you introduce a second unit to a property in a single-family neighborhood, whether it is for a mother-in-law or whoever it may be. There is always a temptation that it then becomes a rental unit when your mother-in-law passes on, and there's concern from neighbors that now the single-family neighborhood becomes more of a duplex rental neighborhood with additional traffic and such that comes along with it. That can be a sensitive topic.

Weber – Ten years ago it might not have been, but with the advent of short-term rentals, it is more of a concern. On Z6, the language in that scared me; *Review the maximum density to allow cluster developments and consider whether additional density may serve as a stronger incentive to encourage land conservation*. But then it also goes onto discuss developer incentives.

Julia Upfal – I think we can eliminate that one.

McKeever – Or could it be worded to imply that the maximum density comes with the cluster alternative?

Julia Upfal – The maximum density is set by the existing zoning?

McKeever – If you want maximum density, then you've got to come up with some sort of open space plan that's going to involve cluster.

Julia Upfal – I think that's kind of what it says here, and what Commissioner Weber is suggesting is that we don't want anything more than what's permitted, but we do want to encourage people to have smaller lots and more density so they can preserve those natural spaces, but not more small lots than what would be permitted otherwise. Oh, I guess what you're saying is maximum density, the closeness ...

McKeever – When a developer walks in, they assume maximum density is a given; they start there and then they want to go up from there by offering a cluster development. We would like to consider maximum density as maximum density.

Weber – I think that's what you're saying.

Julia Upfal – Right, and maximum density being the number of houses, not the size of the lots.

Weber – Right.

Julia Upfal – We will modify or eliminate that action item. Okay, anything else under the zoning action items for housing? How about advocacy?

Chairperson Parel – Can we just clarify what is to be done with these lists? I see you've selected a lead body, then we have to add in a priority/time frame, potential funding source. Is that your group?

Julia Upfal – I think we will add in the supporting partners before the next meeting.

Chairperson Parel – These are all items for the Planning Commission to review, update and explore.

Rose Kim – What we would expect is once the Plan is adopted, we would recommend a joint meeting with the Township Board, and at that point, discussing these action items and prioritizing them.

Chairperson Parel – After it's adopted but not finalized.

Rose Kim – No, it can be finalized, and then going forward, you would regularly look at it and update it as needed.

Paula Lankford – It's basically a tool that the Planning Commission will use for future reviews and, like Rose said, joint meetings with the Township Board. It's not something that you have to fill out now. It's a tool you will use.

Chairperson Parel – One of my concerns is that there are a lot of action items that will require modifications and new ordinances. This is one item, and we have 12 action items. I'm wondering, are we going to update and edit all of these existing ordinances?

Julia Upfal – A lot of communities will take on a big Zoning Ordinance amendment following a master plan adoption. That is generally the next step. Some communities have a master plan implementation section as an agenda item on their regular order of business to make sure that they are constantly evaluating where they are in the progress. They might be taking up one item at a time. The reason these are kind of loose is so that a year from now, you can come back and say, oh we were going to finish that this year, but we haven't even started. You can modify it as time goes and things evolve.

Chairperson Parel – I wanted to make sure it wasn't 12 different modifications to existing ordinances, or new ordinance. I like your idea of having one cleanup for some of these things.

Julia Upfal – Yes, and you can figure out what's going to be easy to amend, such as updating a definition to meet State statute and things like that. Then you can also find out what is a really high priority item and go from there.

Phillips – My experience is that a Planning Commission doesn't get things done – people do, and until you put a name next to an action item, it likely won't happen. I don't know which of these I'm going to lead, but as an acting body, I think we need to say, somebody is going to do this. Until we say somebody is going to do it, and we will review what they did or recommended, then not much is going to happen.

Chairperson Parel – So you're suggesting Dave does the work?

Phillips – Pretty much.

Weber – It's a lot about accountability. There are some things on here that are of note, and in going back, understanding that something may be really hard or really expensive and doesn't have a snowball's chance of happening, we just eliminate it, or identify it as something we choose not to take on.

Phillips – Well, and I think the priority and time frame is something we could think about. For any one of these action items, I'm happy to sign up for certain ones. But, like I said, committees don't get a lot done.

Chairperson Parel – We definitely have to take that into consideration. It makes sense.

Julia Upfal – The next goal after residential is economic development.

Weber – I don't see that I have any comments there.

Phillips – Z1, *Review and update as needed site improvement standards*. I don't know what the current standards are. Is that a document somewhere? Who would review that and update it?

Julia Upfal – There are sections of your Zoning Ordinance that just pertain to site improvements. Usually, we split the standards of the Zoning Ordinance into use-based standards and site standards. Site standards are things like lighting, parking, landscaping, signs, things that apply to all sites regardless of the use. It's in your ordinance.

Dave Campbell – There is an entire chapter of our Zoning Ordinance for Landscaping.

Chairperson Parel – So this action item is to review and potentially update.

Julia Upfal – Yes, any standards in the Zoning Ordinance that relate specifically to site development, and perhaps we could modify this to say *review and update sections of the Zoning Ordinance including design landscaping* to be a little bit clearer. This language was taken straight out of the last Master Plan. Your ordinance doesn't have a section called site improvement standards. That's just a common term for planners, and maybe not as approachable to people who aren't used to using that on a daily basis. We can change that to say the subsections.

Weber – If this is pulled from the last one, we actually did a lot of this when we went through and eliminated EIFS as an example. We changed vinyl to cement siding. We

did a lot of that as site plans were coming to us, we captured those items and then we did make a big change to the ordinance. If this is just a catch all, maybe we have already done it.

Julia Upfal – It's review and update as needed. The intention is to keep that as an ongoing task of the Planning Commission.

Dave Campbell – I would say that parking is one that we are probably overdue to look at. My guess is that our parking standards were probably developed in the 70's and have remained the same since, at least for a lot of the use categories. I think our minimal parking standards ... we overpark most of our land uses. Consistently, we are asking the Planning Commission to deviate from our parking standards because we don't want more impervious surface than is necessary. When we are talking about reviewing some of our site development standards, parking is probably one that we should do sooner rather than later.

Chairperson Parel – I believe that's in here.

Dave Campbell – It is, under Z1.

Julia Upfal – Yes, but maybe reviewing the parking schedule itself should be called out as a specific action addition because that sounds pretty important right now.

Dave Campbell – Some communities don't require 10-foot parking spaces, but I know at least one of you drives a monster truck.

Chairperson Parel – I'm just being cognizant of the time. I think we should end at 6:50, so we have about 8 minutes left.

Dave Campbell – If there is time to nail down ... I know we've talked about it, but what happens next, and the scheduling of it, that would be helpful.

Julia Upfal – From the feedback we've gotten tonight, it seems like we can get a new draft to you by next Monday, and then you will have until the end of the month to provide us feedback. We will have a new draft turned around for the meeting on September 11th. I think if the Planning Commission is comfortable, we will have that draft go to the Township Board on September 12th, and it is just to open it to the public comment period. It's not to take any action. 63 days will take us to the December meeting, with about 2 weeks wiggle room for publishing. I think September 25th is a good deadline for publishing.

Then it will go to the Planning Commission December 4th, one week before the Township Board on December 12th, and the Planning Commission will adopt the plan. They can make a recommendation to the Township Board for final approval. Adoption is recognized as a two-thirds vote by the Planning Commission with a public hearing at that meeting.

Paula Lankford – So the December meeting will be a public hearing.

Julia Upfal – Yes. Once approved, the plan is finalized and sent to utility partners, et cetera.

Dave Campbell – Is it just a typical public hearing in terms of notices? Is it 15-day?

Julia Upfal – I believe so, but there is the 63-day public comment period. That has to be noticed as well.

Dave Campbell – Paula and I are building our schedule and we just want to make sure we hit those noticing dates.

Julia Upfal – We will confirm the noticing requirements and verify.

Dave Campbell – Oakland Press needs a lot of lead time.

Rose Kim – And we will also send you the Word drafts of the notices.

Julia Upfal – I know we didn't get through all of the action items, but I feel like I've received a lot of good feedback from you. We definitely have some revisions to make but this was a helpful discussion. I think there are some points that we hit on that really need to be emphasized a little bit more, and to bring more clarity to some goals of the Plan so that we aren't conveying that we want to attract a bunch of new development to Commerce Township. We will work on making those revisions and making sure the Plan is aligned with your vision. We will have something to you on Monday.

Chairperson Parel – When will the email go out with the Adobe redline?

Julia Upfal – On Monday as well.

Chairperson Parel – Thank you. We really do appreciate it.

D. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Phillips, supported by Loskill, to adjourn the meeting at 6:47pm.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Joe Loskill, Secretary