

**SUPERIOR CHARTER TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
MAY 28, 2014
APPROVED MINUTES
Page 1 of 4
5-1 CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Guenther called the regular meeting to order at 7:35 p.m.

5-2 ROLL CALL

The following members were present: Baker, Gardner, Guenther, McGill, Phillips and Steele. Anderson was absent. Also present were Don Pennington and Rodney Nanney, Township Planners, Jacob Rushlow, Township Engineer and Rick Mayernik, Building/Zoning Administrator.

5-3 DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

A quorum was present.

5-4 ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A motion was made by Gardner and supported by Phillips to adopt the agenda as presented. The motion carried.

5-5 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. MINUTES OF THE APRIL 23, 2014 REGULAR MEETING

A motion was made by Gardner and supported by Phillips to approve the minutes as corrected. The motion carried.

5-6 CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

There was no Citizen Participation.

5-7 CORRESPONDENCE

There was no Correspondence.

5-8 PUBLIC HEARINGS, DELIBERATIONS AND ACTIONS

There were no Public Hearings.

**SUPERIOR CHARTER TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
MAY 28, 2014
APPROVED MINUTES
Page 2 of 4
5-9 REPORTS**

A. Ordinance Officer

A motion was made by Baker and supported by Phillips to receive the report. The motion carried.

B. Building Inspector

A motion was made by Baker and supported by Gardner to receive the report. The motion carried.

C. Zoning Administrator

A motion was made by Phillips and supported by Gardner to receive the report. The motion carried.

5-10 OLD BUSINESS

A. STPC#13-09 Master Plan Update – Technology Center Area Plan

Nanney presented the draft amendments to the Master Plan. He said changes were made based on the comments made by the Planning Commission during the April meeting. He identified the significant changes:

1. Added *Access to US-23* as a challenge, page 10-6.
2. Add policies to *Street and Infrastructure Polices*, page 10-14.
3. Add descriptions of LFDA and TIF to Implementation Strategies, page 10-14.

Gardner questioned the idea of “*Development Ready Sites*” on page 10-16. Nanney said some such marketing is done in other communities. Phillips noted that the Township would not participate in marketing of development-ready sites.

McGill suggested a problem with promoting industrial uses next to residential ones. Nanney cited the extensive landscaping and setback requirements of the zoning ordinance and said that the land use compatibility would be addressed on a case by case basis.

Phillips questioned referring to the master plan amendment as the “area plan” for the district. Nanney said the plan amendment satisfies the criteria in Article 10 of the Zoning Ordinance for an area plan because it functions as an

**SUPERIOR CHARTER TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
MAY 28, 2014
APPROVED MINUTES
Page 3 of 4**

area plan until a developer comes in with a project-specific area plan. He said the term is used in the Technology Center amendment the same way it is used in the Dixboro Plan.

Mayernik questioned keeping the east side of Leforge Rd. in the Urban Residential district. Nanney described the area as a small rural neighborhood.

Phillips said he did not see any discussion in the plan about why the area is no longer appropriate for residential use. He also asked why the plan identifies reasons against expanding the Planned Manufacturing district. Nanney said it was important to present a full analysis of the characteristics of the area to demonstrate that the plan represents an unbiased review.

Phillips acknowledged Township Supervisor Ken Schwartz in the audience and asked if he would like to address the Planning Commission.

Schwartz said one of the purposes of the Plan Amendment was to recognize that the some of the residential Planned Community (PC) plans approved in the area but never developed are no longer viable. He said those PC districts would then be terminated and the area re-master planned. He said there was value in establishing facts that show the non-viability of residential at these locations.

Schwartz also suggested identifying the desired land uses as something technology campus-like rather than as industrial. He also asked why proximity to a county drain was identified as a negative. Nanney explained that it is a challenge because it limits the layout of a facility.

The Planning Commission discussed the value of land conservation on page 10-12. Baker questioned the statement that the Township opposed conservation easements within the water/sewer district. She said the highest population density is within the water/sewer district and therefore open space preservation is needed more than in undeveloped areas. Nanney said the Township did not want to see land in the water and sewer district put into conservation. Guenther said the policy made sense because of the investment in the infrastructure in the district.

There was no further discussion. Nanney said he would prepare a clean draft reflecting the Planning Commission's comments.

5-11 NEW BUSINESS

There was no New Business.

**SUPERIOR CHARTER TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
MAY 28, 2014
APPROVED MINUTES
Page 4 of 4**

5-12 POLICY DISCUSSION

A. Changes to GAAMP – Local Jurisdiction in Residential Areas

Nanney updated the Commission on changes to Michigan's Generally Accepted Agricultural Management Practices.

5 -13 ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Gardner and supported by Steele to adjourn at 10:01 p.m. The motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,
David Phillips
Planning Commission Secretary (Acting)

Deborah L. Kuehn
Recording Secretary
Superior Charter Township
3040 N. Prospect
Ypsilanti, MI 48198 (734) 482-6099