

Bear Creek Township Board/Planning Commission Joint Meeting
October 23, 2019 6:30 p.m.

- I. Called to order at: 6:40 p.m.
- II. Roll Call
 - a. **Planning Commission:** Coveyou, Kendziorski, Urman, Brown, Olliffe, Haven
 - i. Absent: Mays
 - ii. *8:45 p.m. Haven left the meeting*
 - b. **BCT:** Keiser, Kendziorski, Hoffman
 - i. Absent: Golding, Nowland
- III. Visitors: Tammy Doernenburg, Mathew Cooke, Jennifer Neal
- IV. Welcome and Introductions
- V. Review Proposed Agenda
 - a. Tonight's meeting will serve as a review of chapters 10-12. Any comments will be considered by Networks Northwest.
- VI. Review of Master Plan Chapters 10-12
 - a. **Chapter 10: Population Projection & Needs Assessment**
 - i. In the introductory paragraphs to this chapter:
 - 1. Urman suggested tweaking the portion about two car garages. It seems that the current trend is that people want to build smaller homes.
 - ii. In the section titled "Population Projection":
 - 1. Cooke distributed an updated portion of this section. He also added Peak Season Population Projection numbers into this section. Additionally, he added in Building Permits broken down by year. On average, 23.8 new homes were built per year from 2014-2018.
 - 2. Keiser suggested that the 2020 projected population should be more around 6,800.
 - 3. Doernenburg mentioned that the average household size is dropping in the area, so the numbers should reflect that.
 - 4. Urman believes we need to highlight the verbiage about the need to build and maintain infrastructure. These are key points. Perhaps it should be a goal in the master plan to build so much per year.
 - a. Keiser believes a study would need to be done first, however, for budgeting purposes, this may make sense. The township could save funds each year to work towards this goal of building and maintaining infrastructure. This is something we can look into in the future.
 - iii. In the section titled "Community Centers":
 - 1. Doernenburg suggested removing K-Mart, as it is no longer in business, and clarifying "Office Depot" to say "Office Max".
 - 2. Coveyou asked for clarification on the difference between Community Centers and Hyper-Centers. Can we add in clearer language to distinguish them or combine them instead?
 - iv. In the section titled "Hyper-Centers":
 - 1. Kendziorski suggested that "Meijer" should be used instead of "Meijer's" in order to be grammatically correct.
 - v. In the section titled "Industrial Needs Analysis":
 - 1. Doernenburg mentioned that available housing is necessary for industry to be able to expand here.
 - a. Coveyou agreed and suggested that the industry needs are full circle. Industry pulls people here and people pull industry here. Additionally, the desire to live here pulls industry here. The current trend is that people don't go where the jobs are, they go where they want to live and find a job

there or bring their business. They move here because they want to be here, not because there is business opportunity. Then, talent pulls the jobs up. This is a continuous cycle.

- vi. In the section titled “2008 Public Input”:
 1. In the sub-section titled “Stakeholder Interviews”:
 - a. Kendziorski suggested reformatting this section to make the sub-sections clearer and more user-friendly.
 - b. Haven asked if this information is still relevant today... This data was from 11 years ago and lots of these people are retired.
 - i. Additionally, Haven asked about the commentary from the stakeholders. Are the comments relevant anymore? We could remove the entire sub-section of “Stakeholder Interviews”.
 - c. Doernenburg suggested cleaning the section up and removing the names of the interviewees. Additionally, she suggested calling the section “Historical Public Input” instead of “2008 Public Input”.
 - i. Conclusion to remove the entire “Stakeholder Interviews” sub-section and keep the “Visioning Sessions” before it and “Community Survey” after it. This information will be sufficient to express Public Input.
 2. In the sub-section titled “Community Survey”:
 - a. Doernenburg pointed out that the second to last paragraph in this sub-section needs to be removed.
 - b. Urman stated that the word “control” in the last paragraph is strong wording. Can we change it to “guided”? The goal is to help “guide” the growth rather than “control” it.

b. Chapter 11: Guiding Principles

i. Planning Principle Number 1:

1. Urman pointed out that the language “manage and control growth” is strong here... perhaps we could adjust it to say “manage and guide growth, don’t allow it to control the township”.
2. Coveyou suggested we capture the concept of cluster developments, open space, and conservation design in this section. The idea would be to have denser subdivisions with more open space. The suggested language would be “clustered housing with conservation development”.
 - a. Hoffman asked if the density gets too tight, will there be open space? Open space is different now- it could be a pond instead of a playground, etc. The goal is meaningful open space. As a township, when developers come before us, we should be asking what open space means to them. The key is to develop USABLE open space. It would not make sense to have open space that is swampy or unusable.
 - b. Coveyou also asked about interconnections between developments. Can we add language about trails or connections from development to development?
 - i. Doernenburg suggested we also add language about connections to sidewalks. The connections should not only be from development to development, but also to amenities.

ii. Planning Principle Number 3:

1. Coveyou brought up highway access management. If a business is placed on a parcel which sits on an adjacent road, can the main access to the business be on the adjacent road rather than the main road? That would help with road access by minimizing curb cuts on main roads.

- a. Urman pointed out that we can make the language stronger in Planning Principle Number 4 to reflect this concept.
 - b. Doernenburg suggested we take it a step further and put in new zoning language to require that.
 - i. For example, businesses between Lears Rd and Intertown should have access on Anderson Rd rather than the highway.
 - c. Haven suggested we use language such as “utilizing access management to require ancillary road access whenever possible”.
 - d. Urman pointed out that this concept also benefits Planning Principle Number 2.
 - 2. Coveyou would also like to see more language about the greenbelt in this section. He feels there should be a stronger greenbelt requirement to keep businesses from having their parking lot all the way to the road.
 - a. Doernenburg clarified that to do that would require a zoning text amendment.
 - i. Planning Principle Number 5:
 - a. Coveyou would like to strengthen the Agritourism concept in this section. He feels the goal should be to keep traditional agriculture, but also to allow agritourism in order to sustain the farming operations.
 - b. Hoffman and Coveyou will give input to Cooke on this section.
 - ii. Planning Principle Number 9:
 - 1. Urman would like to encourage walkable neighborhoods. We should not only emphasize this in this section, but also tie it to the cluster housing and new developments.
 - iii. Planning Principle Number 10:
 - 1. Brown suggested we take out the first bullet point about infrastructure. Is it relevant?
 - b. Keiser said 10-15% are still working to get reliable high-speed internet and wireless communication.
 - c. Brown suggested we modify it to say “continue to work with responsible parties...” so it shows that this is a work in progress.
- c. **Chapter 12: Future Land Use**
 - iv. In the section titled “High Density-Residential”:
 - 1. Olliffe suggested we clean up the verbiage in the last sentence of the third paragraph.
 - 2. Keiser asked if 4-7 units per acre is correct in the fourth paragraph.
 - a. Doernenburg corrected that it should read 5-10 units.
 - v. In the section titled “Agricultural”:
 - 1. Urman suggested adding agritourism information there instead of earlier in the Master Plan.
 - 2. Coveyou suggested clustering Agritourism together using an overlay with form-based zoning. Any farms within that area would be designed to look like a manicured farm. You could still farm in other areas, but this area would be the area zoned and prepared for Agritourism. (Ex. Wineries clustered together).
 - b. Haven questioned how could you restrict it to one area.
 - i. Clarification that you would not be restricting it to one specific area. Individuals could still apply for a special-use permit to have Agritourism in other areas. This process would just make it simpler for people to participate in Agritourism in designated areas.
 - ii. There could be more than one designated Agritourism area in the Township.

- c. Hoffman believes that individuals will not like these restrictions. We would also have to keep in mind that different things grow in different soils. An area may not work for some farms.
 - d. If the Township were to consider something like this, we would have to define what would count as Agritourism.
 - e. Cooke suggested we consider adding Agritourism as a category on the map legend.
 - vi. In the section titled “Open Space/Greenway”:
 - 1. Olliffe suggested we remove the last sentence.
 - 2. Keiser clarified that you have to have more than one individual parcel to be considered “open space”.
 - vii. In the section titled “Green Strip”:
 - 1. Doernenburg suggested we add in language here about road access and using side roads rather than main roads for access.
 - viii. In the section titled “Neighborhood Commercial”:
 - 2. Urman asked about neighborhood commercial shops/party stores/ etc. Do we even need this section? It seems that small convenience stores are not as relevant anymore.
 - a. If we keep this section, we would like to clarify that these neighborhood commercials shops would not be a full gas station, but more of a party store with one or two gas pumps. (Ex. Corner Grocer size)
 - 3. Coveyou suggested mixed-use commercial with a connector to housing/developments on the south side of town.
 - 4. Depending on where these neighborhood commercial shops were located, it could be a very beneficial thing. For example, the area out by the Snowmobile Club could benefit from something like this.
 - a. Consensus to leave this section in the Master Plan.
 - ix. On the “Future Land Use Plan” map:
 - 1. Olliffe asked if we need to update the Future Land Use map to reflect any zoning changes that have happened. For example, the Commercial use on US 31 N... we have rezoned some of the parcels on the north side of the highway to Commercial since this map was last updated.
 - a. Doernenburg clarified that currently, the parcels on the north side of the highway are highlighted as mixed-use, which includes commercial. The Future Land Use Map will not be changed every time we make a zoning change, rather, it should serve as a projection of what the zoning goals are for the township.
 - 2. Urman asked what industrial use includes.
 - a. Doernenburg clarified that all commercial can go in industrial.
 - b. Keiser clarified that Hearthsides went in industrial as transitional housing.
 - c. The question was raised if the Commercial strip along US 31 N should become Industrial, as it is next to an area already designated for Industrial. This would increase the zoning requirements that are already in place. If we did this, it would have to follow the current line of Fotchman Industrial Park, rather than go all the way to Pickerel Lake Rd.
 - d. Doernenburg pointed out that along the highway by Hearthsides is currently high-density residential.
 - a. Coveyou suggested that the future land use for Hearthsides should be high-density residential. However, would that push the Industrial section out?

- b. Coveyou also suggested adding more high-density residential to the south, or moving it north by the lake? Either way, we should plan for more high-density residential, as that comes along with industry.
 - e. Keiser suggested we put commercial and industrial on the highway and high density residential behind it. Or to put commercial on the highway corridor and less industrial.
 - a. If we are planning for more industry, we will also have to plan for density and housing too.
 - f. Coveyou asked if you can zone to the point where you clarify which types of industry are acceptable (to control things like noise). Potentially, we could put industrial behind commercial, which would be on the highway.
 - a. Jennifer Neal clarified that our planned industrial sections are all for lower industrial (I-1, not I-2).
- 3. Across the highway from the commercial strip will remain mixed-use. Additionally, the low-density residential by Hoffman's on the highway will be mixed-use on the highway, with high-density residential behind it.
 - a. Clarification that Hearthside should be high-density residential.
- 4. The rest of US 31 going down towards McDonalds and the golf course will remain mixed-use. M-119 will remain mixed use.
- 5. In regards to Mitchell and Division:
 - a. Currently it is medium-density residential. Doernenburg suggested we consider high-density residential from Division up to the city limits on the north side of Mitchell. On the south side of Mitchell, from Division up to the city limits could be mixed-use.
 - i. Doernenburg suggested that high-density residential areas should also allow for businesses that service those same high-density residential areas.
 - ii. Consensus: From Division up to the city limits, the south side of Mitchell should be mixed-use on the frontage of Mitchell, with high-density residential behind going towards Atkins. The north side of Mitchell will be High-Density Residential, except for the roadside of Division- that will be marked Mixed Use.
 - b. Going east on Mitchell from Division down to just past Louie's, that stretch should be mixed-use.
 - c. Going north on Division towards the golf course can be left as is.
- 6. Areas that can be left as is:
 - a. McDougal and Atkins Rd.
 - b. The area near Lears and Howard (which is currently all high-density residential)
 - c. Independence Village (which is currently mixed use)

8:45p.m. Haven left the meeting.

- 7. Keiser suggested we make 131 mixed-use from Meijer down to Intertown.
 - a. Coveyou would like to make Intertown to the top of the hill high-density residential.
 - b. Consensus: From Meijer south to Intertown on 131, there should be mixed-use along the highway. Behind it, there should be high-density residential on the west side of the highway, medium-density residential on the east side.

VII. Upcoming Meetings: November 20, 2019 at 6:00 p.m.

- a. We can continue our future land use discussion at the next meeting if necessary.

VIII. Adjournment: 9:05 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Emma Kendziorski

Emma Kendziorski, Township Clerk