

SCIO TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
827 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48103
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES OF MONDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2008

1) CALL TO ORDER

Chair Arscott called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m.

2) ROLL CALL

Present: Dries, Arscott, Mayo, Kangas, Green, Fuller
Absent: Hanson

Others present: Doug Lewan, Carlisle-Wortman, Planning Consultant
Matt Parks, OHM, Township Engineering Consultant

3) COMMUNICATIONS AND/OR CORRESPONDENCE

Notice of Public Hearing, Proposed Amendments to Charter Township of Ann Arbor Master Plan, December 1, 2008; Letter dated November 10, 2008 from Mark Wing, asking for consideration of change to his Master Plan Land Use Designation; Planning Department, Charter Township of Pittsfield, Notice of Adoption of Amendments to Township Comprehensive Plan dated November 12, 2008; Request for Review and Comment on Proposed Amendment to Charter Township of Pittsfield Comprehensive Plan dated November 12, 2008; Offer from Crane's Detroit Business; brochure Michigan State Extension Service, Michigan Farm Bureau, Michigan Citizen Planner Workshops on wind, energy, sighting and policy issues; Newsletter from Astion Environmental Tech Bits, Fall, 2008; Michigan Legislative Update; November, 2008 Michigan Township News.

4) PRESENTATIONS REQUESTED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION

None

5) PUBLIC COMMENT

Paula Globerson, 195 Rockwood Court

Do not think enough information went out to enough people to comment on this conditional rezoning; applicant cannot do any surface water discharge according to Clean Water Act; concern with an adequate sewer system; many people purchased homes with the understanding that they were connected to Ann Arbor sewer and water; feel decision should be postponed to allow for more community input.

6) BUSINESS SESSION

A) Advertised Public hearings

None

B) Unfinished business

None

C) New Business

1. OA #3394, Honey Creek, conditional rezoning.

Chair Arscott provided a chronological review of this matter.

Applicant/representative:

Michael Boggio, project architect

Summarized limits placed on themselves in the process. Architect made a presentation including the following points: this is a green development with buffers and open space; perimeter of site is to have unique and identifiable fencing/hedging to the entire site; first phase would be the Jackson Road commercial/residential mixed/multi-purpose multiple story buildings; residential area is to be a small scale community; there will be no on-site sewer treatment; phasing will start with some retail, then residential and lastly a park; if progress is not made then the rezoning would revert back to original zoning.

Comments by Doug Lewan:

(Report placed into the record.)

Comments by Matt Parks:

(Report placed into the record.)

Key issues and concerns raised by Commission members:

- C-2 zoning does not allow for multi-story mixed use. (Doug Lewan points out C-2 could be changed or a PUD.)
- Does developer intend to get "LEEDS" certification? (Applicant response: LEEDS certification will not be required.)
- Project is not in the sewer district; there are presently 100-plus REU's available. (Applicant response: This application does not include building any treatment facilities by themselves.)
- Question about road improvements on Park Road. (Applicant response: When Park Road project is developed, then a decision will be made on going forward with possible changes)
- Senior assisted living project on Park Road is difficult due to road conditions, along with the lack of public transit for employees.
- Ratio of independent to assisted living is like 10:1.
- The mixture of home types is well balanced so that all site plans will be back before the Planning Commission and Township Board; allowing access to applicant's DEQ permits is helpful.
- Concerned about Park Road improvements. Plans indicate maintaining existing hedgerows, but there is no language in the narrative; concern about suitability of elderly/assisted living,
- Density concerns, Can the Planning Commission rezone only part of a plan? (Applicant's response: Preference is that consideration should be given to the entire plan at one time. Doug Lewan response; Yes, Planning Commission can rezone only parts of application.)
- Zoning Ordinance Amendment Committee is working on permitted/conditional uses in each district, and talked about residential being a conditional use in the C-2 district; likes the applicant's approach to items raised; confident applicant and Planning Commission understand the scope of sewer issues raised, and limitations of Planning Commission recommendations; problems with parcel six (6) is not a "big issue" by itself.

- There are many positives in this plan to give credit to the applicant; favor moving this forward so that sewer issues can be addressed; wish entire site to be considered; intended senior area makes a smooth transition for use to the east to a more rural area to the west; commitment to multi uses is a determining factor to move this application forward; there was no opposition in most recent public hearing.
- Concerns with Phase 5.
- Do not like planned use for Phase 5, public access question.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER DRIES, SUPPORT BY COMMISSIONER FULLER,

**ORDINANCE AMENDMENT #3394, HONEY CREEK REZONING OF MULTIPLE PARCELS AND ZONING DESIGNATIONS AS OUTLINED BY THE APPLICATION MATERIAL.
(CONDITIONAL REZONING)**

BASED UPON THE INFORMATION RECEIVED FROM THE APPLICANT, AND REFLECTED IN MINUTES OF THIS MEETING, THE PLANNING COMMISSION FINDS PHASE 1A, PHASE 2, PHASE 3, PHASE 4, AND PHASE 5 OF THE CONDITIONAL REZONING FOR HONEY CREEK, WITH THE CONDITIONS NARRATIVE RECEIVED BY THE TOWNSHIP ON NOVEMBER 14, 2008, MEET THE INFORMATIONAL REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 16.03 AND THE FACTORS FOUND IN SECTION 16.04 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE AS WELL AS THE REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 16.05 CONDITIONAL REZONING OF LAND, AND RECOMMENDS APPROVAL.

THIS RECOMMENDATION INCLUDES THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

AS OUTLINED IN THE CONDITION NARRATIVE PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT AND AS AMENDED THIS EVENING AND REFLECTED IN THE MINUTES OF THIS MEETING.

**Roll call: Yes: Dries, Arscott, Green, Fuller
No: Mayo, Kangas**

YES: 4

NO: 2

MOTION CARRIED

7) REPORTS/COMMISSIONER ACTIVITY

None

8) PUBLIC COMMENT

Tina Richardson

Public attendance was low because of short notice; cost of paving of Park and Staebler Road should have been considered; it is probable that a SAD will have to be created to pay for road improvement(s); concern that this recommendation guarantees utility service to the project; concern that the Planning Commission is sending the wrong message.

9) APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None

10) ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER MAYO, SUPPORT BY COMMISSIONER DRIES TO ADJOURN AT 9:37 P.M.

YES: 6

NO: 0

MOTION CARRIED

Respectfully submitted by:
Christine Green, Secretary

Transcription by James H. LaVoie