



**ACME TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
ACME TOWNSHIP HALL
6042 Acme Road, Williamsburg MI 49690
7:00 p.m. Monday, July 25, 2005**

Meeting called to Order at 7:00 p.m.

Members present: O. Sherberneau (Chair), B. Carstens, C. David, R. Hardin, D. Krause, D. Morgan, E. Takayama (7:20 p.m.) M. Vermetten
Members excused: J. Pulcipher
Staff present: J. Hull, Zoning Administrator
S. Corpe, Office & Planning Coordinator/Recording Secretary
J. Iacoangeli, Consulting Planner
J. Christopherson, Township Counsel

1. Consent Calendar:

Motion by Krause, support by Vermetten to approve the Consent Calendar as printed, including:

Receive and File:

- a) Draft unapproved minutes:
 - 1. Board of Trustees
 - a. 07/12/05 Regular Meeting
 - b. 07/21/05 Special Meeting
 - 2. Public Safety Advisory Meeting: 07/18/05
- b) Planning & Zoning News June 2005

Action:

- c) Approve minutes:
 - 1. 06/27/05 regular meeting
 - 2. 07/19/05 special meeting
- d) Review and approve agenda, inquiry as to conflicts of interest: Approved with no conflicts of interest noted.

Motion carried unanimously.

1. Limited Public Comment:

Andy Andres Sr., 4946 M-72 East commented regarding the political signs being put up. He stated that he placed 4 signs on "Yuba Hill" but they were removed quickly. He replaced them with 3 more signs, but an hour later they were removed. This is stealing, and he plans to turn in the perpetrators to the State Police if he identifies them.

Mike DeAgostino, Public Relations Manager for the Grand Traverse Resort, was asked by Andrew Bateman, the Resort General Manager, to provide the Planning Commission with a brochure from Development Design Group, Inc. This Baltimore-based firm is experienced with town center design.

- 2. Special Presentation: Introduction to Wade-Trim, the planning consultants engaged to assist with public visioning and formulation of a Future Land Use Map amendment to the Master Plan:** Brian Souza with Wade Trim introduced himself, his firm and the plan of action to the Master Plan. The two company principals who will be working with the township were unavoidably unable to attend this evening. Community leaders will be trained to gather, analyze and present public input data in the format of a future land use map. Krause

asked how long the process may take from start to finish. Mr. Souza stated that this is dependent on the level of public participation. Once the committee is ready, it will take about 30 days to gather data and another 30-60 days to compile and refine the data and prepare it for presentation back to the community. David asked about the data-gathering committee. Mr. Souza stated that two teams of community leaders will be invited by the Board, and that the group will be trained in data gathering and sent back into their community groups to get the information. The committee should also be able to begin meaningful dialogue between various factions that can be continued throughout the community as well.

3. **Annual Election of Officers (Chairman, Vice Chairman, Secretary):** Morgan asked if this could be postponed until later in the meeting, as Takayama is expected to attend but is not yet present. Hull called Takayama's cell phone to check on his status. This agenda item was suspended for 10 minutes until he could arrive

Motion by Vermetten, support by Morgan to move this agenda item to position 5, moving items 4 and 5 up to positions 3 and 4 respectively. Motion carried unanimously.

4. **Announce public comment period regarding proposed Master Plan Amendment (addition of farmland preserve zone map and associated text amendment) and set public hearing date:**

Motion by Vermetten, support by Hardin to schedule a public hearing regarding the proposed Master Plan amendment for the September 26, 2005 regular Planning Commission meeting.

There was discussion about whether or not a special meeting should be called for this public hearing, as there is an attempt to meet a deadline for being able to apply for state matching funds.

Motion failed by a vote of 3 in favor (Hardin, Sherberneau, Vermetten) and 4 opposed (David, Carstens, Krause, Morgan).

Motion by David, support by Morgan to schedule a public hearing regarding the proposed Master Plan amendment for a special meeting on Thursday, September 15. Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

5. **Continued Discussion/Deliberation:**

- a) **Application #2004-3P by Meijer, Inc., 2929 Walker NW, Grand Rapids MI 49544 for SUP/Site Plan Approval for development of a 232,360 sq. ft. grocery/general merchandise store, 2,400 sq. ft. convenience store with 10 gas pumps, and 100,041 sq. ft. of additional commercial space on property located at 5896 Lautner Road (the southeast corner of M-72 East and Lautner Road) and currently zoned B-3, Planned Shopping Center:** Iacoangeli prepared a site plan issues checklist for the Commission's use in providing feedback as far as any required modifications to the site plan prior to advanced deliberation on the application. The site plan to be used for discussion purposes is the one submitted at last week's meeting.

Question 1: Carstens asked if Iacoangeli believes the intent of the definition of "planned shopping center" has been met. Iacoangeli believes progress has been made, but that more must be done to create pedestrian linkages between buildings along with parking to building linkages. Krause suggested last week that walkways coming in from Lautner Road be continued through the site and through an enlarged landscaped area before entering the proposed Meijer building. David noted that the issue of clear separation of pedestrian ways from automobile maneuvering areas

remains outstanding; Iacoangeli pointed out that this is addressed by a separate question farther down the checklist. Vermetten noted that decisions about the “macro-level” issues hadn’t been made yet, and these seem to be some more “micro-level” issues. Iacoangeli stated that the macro discussions are underway through other avenues. He asked Mr. Nowakowski if Meijer would put their application on hold until those discussions had progressed further, but he indicated that it was to proceed normally.

Carstens was concerned that the current site plan does not display precise points where walkways connect to outlot buildings. There is a general sidewalk plan for connecting different areas of the site. Iacoangeli noted that the applicant has indicated that construction of a Meijer store and gas station are planned for the first phase; the township could indicate that it will consider only that facet of the application at this time and defer any consideration of the balance of the site (the outlots) to a later process. Several members of the Commission found this option desirable. Iacoangeli noted that the question of the Village is still outstanding. The market study for the Village indicated that there is room in the local market area for about 800,000 sq. ft. of additional retail space, and the Village contemplated using all of that. Any construction on this site will detract from the amount of retail space that should be considered for inclusion in the Village if and when it moves forward. David asked to what extent approval of future phases would be implied, and whether the township would retain full discretion over those phases. Iacoangeli responded that any eventual SUP would very clearly state that the township is considering only the question of a Meijer, and whether a gas station is required and if so where it should be located on the site. Steve Hayward, planner for the applicant, stated that this concept has been discussed by the applicant favorably as well, as it would allow time to discuss how the Meijer site and Lautner Commons would integrate into the Village should it move forward.

Carstens stated that in general the township requires parking in the side or rear of a property, and asked if a planned shopping center is exempt from these requirements. Hull stated that the Planning Commission is granted discretion by the Zoning Ordinance to deviate from this standard. Carstens believes that the parking lot should be on the east side of the building, bringing the building closer to Lautner Road, which would enhance pedestrian connection to the Village site. He believes the standard for side or rear parking should be upheld. Vermetten believes he recalls Mr. Nowakowski stating that parking in the rear is not feasible at a Meijer due to the way deliveries are made to the store. Krause believes that this was addressed in the Master Plan, which he believes says that a large retail store can only function with parking in front. Carstens is recalling a site visit to the Village at Rochester where parking was largely behind buildings; Krause feels that this is not comparable because the stores there are smaller. Iacoangeli drew a schematic of that development and demonstrated that there are larger parking areas in front of the two anchor stores, a Parisienne department store and a Farmer Jack’s grocery.

Iacoangeli noted that the Master Plan talks about the possibility of having a big box store anchor a town center development. He also noted that so far, every iteration of the Meijer plan has shown parking at the front of the building.

Carstens asked why it would be prudent to not require Meijer to demonstrate the layout and use of the outlot buildings at this time. Iacoangeli stated that such labeling is very important to understanding traffic impacts, and that it’s important to remember that no actual or implied approval of outlot development would be granted. Carstens wanted to reinforce his point that the Master Plan calls for commercial development, if it occurs on this parcel, to be integrated into a walkable town center,

and the closer the building is to the road, the more pedestrian accessible it would be.

Vermetten noted that hours were spent last month on a macro analysis on 2-4 pieces of property in the township. He stated that he doesn't care how big the store is – that is the applicant's affair for him – but that location is very important. The idea of using Lautner Road as the main street of a village development appeals to him. Looking at only consideration of the Meijer and possibly gas station at this time is fine, as long as it is done from the macro, multi-property perspective. It must be done to flow into and become the anchor for a town center. Iacoangeli stated that the Commission is being forced into concurrent macro and micro discussions, and it would be so much better if the applicant would defer for a month to allow macro discussions to proceed but they are unwilling to do it.

Krause asked if there is general agreement that on some property or another, there will be a Meijer store. He believes that the concern of this evening is making that store what the township believes it should be in terms of architecture, landscaping, parking and other details. Whichever side of the street the stores ends up on, decisions as to an acceptable form of the store can be made this evening. This is another argument for blocking out any thought of the outlots at this time.

Takayama asked if phase 1 would include all entrance roads/parking and traffic pattern layout, and Mr. Hayward concurred. This means that in large part the ultimate layout of future phases would be predetermined, as it would be expensive to change the infrastructure layout. Therefore, he would advise extreme caution in proceeding with a limited scope, when the scope may not actually be so limited and would lock the township into a future development pattern without due consideration. Takayama also stated that he has traveled through Chum's Corners several times a day for the past week. The new Menard's store sits far back from US 31, and nobody crosses the street between it and the Glen's grocery store. It would be dangerous to do so. He therefore agrees that planning the layout of the Meijer site to integrate with what might come on the west side of Lautner Road is critical.

Iacoangeli called the question of whether the entire site would be considered or just the proposed Meijer store and gas station, or whether Meijer can wait for 30-60 days to find out where discussions lead as to which property they will ultimately occupy. He agrees with Krause that no matter where the building ends up, there can and should be discussion now about architecture, parking, lighting heights, landscaping and the like. Morgan asked for clarification on whether a formal approval of a Meijer on this site becomes 100% portable; Iacoangeli stated it would not. If the building is to be moved to a different property, a new application would be required; however, the applicant would have a very detailed understanding of what they would have to do to satisfy the township and receive that second approval. It was agreed that discussion would proceed exclusively about the Meijer store and site design at this time.

Type of Structure: How does the Commission wish to deal with the requirement that “all permitted activities shall be conducted within a wholly enclosed building.” Tim Stoecker, attorney for Meijer, recited an additional section of the ordinance stating that exceptions can be made for outdoor eating areas or other outdoor sales areas. Mr. Hayward stated that Mr. Nowakowski has discussed the concept of a pedestrian area in front of the store with lighting and seating, and that they could provide some sort of decorative fencing around the garden center that would allow light and air to reach the plants. Corpe noted that at K-Mart and Tom's the garden areas are defined by fencing. Iacoangeli displayed a picture of the way an outdoor center was handled at the Eastwood Wal-Mart through requirements imposed by Mr. Hayward as their

township planner. The outdoor center enclosure is made of materials that match the rest of the façade. Mr. Hayward stated that Mr. Nowakoski is amenable to a design of this nature, which was accepted by the Commission.

Separation of Parking and Pedestrian Ways: Mr. Hayward stated that Meijer is amenable to a pedestrian walkway along the building façade, perhaps with handicapped parking up close to the building, subject to Metro Fire requirements for fire lanes. The walkway would have seating and pedestrian-scaled lighting.

Discussion turned to the language in the ordinance about the demarcation and separate of cars and pedestrians. Iacoangeli stated that he has never seen such stringent language in an ordinance before, and directed discussion towards a meaningful interpretation of this requirement. There seemed to be general agreement that raised sidewalks throughout the parking lot seem imprudent. There was discussion about a central esplanade/walkway or walkways leading towards the main entryways to the building. The Commission could also choose to waive the requirement. Vermetten noted that at the airport there is lighting and different colored paving that clearly indicates a preferred pedestrian pathway. Mr. Hayward stated that by their nature, stores such as this are normally automobile accessed. Few people come out with one bag; most have a shopping cart. Mr. Nowakowski indicated that it would be difficult for shopping carts to go up and down over the edges of a raised pedestrian area. Hull read a definition of “demarcation”, noting that it is simply the notation of a boundary, and that whether or not it is raised doesn’t enter into the question. It could simply be a marking on the pavement.

Takayama would like to see some green space between the parking and the building. He proposed pathways through a large green island in front of the building. Such a feature could provide some pedestrian safety, a green buffer parallel to and accenting the large building façade, a place for people to wait for their cars to come around, and perhaps a focal point for handicapped parking. He dislikes how the main traffic route at the T.C. Meijer is directly in front of the store, with people darting in and out haphazardly. Mr. Stopeker suggested a 20’ streetscaped area adjacent to the front of the building.

Hardin asked about transition strips and the proposal to reduce the size of them. What properties would be impacted by having the store located closer to them? Iacoangeli stated that he does not understand the requirement for a 200’ strip on all sides of the property. If the store is 50’ or 200’ from the property line, nobody will want to build a store that faces the back of the store. New development would back up to the store, creating something of a service corridor between the two. Carstens recalled that an enhanced landscaping buffer is generally required between commercial and residential uses to mitigate impacts. Green space also absorbs runoff. Iacoangeli noted that a 200’ setback flies in the face of walkability as well.

It appears that consensus states that walkways can be at grade but must be clearly marked as walkways and should be aligned with the major entrances to the project. The strip in front of the building would be expanded, and handicapped parking along the building façade would be permitted.

Transition Strips: The revised site plan shows a decreased transition strip on the east side of the property, with the open space that would have been there being relocated to and consolidated in other portions of the site for more meaningful open space. Rather than 200’, 50’ is proposed. There would be a roadway in this area for service vehicles. A landscaping plan has not been submitted yet, but it would certainly contain trees. Vermetten noted that the transition strip was intended to separate

business and residential uses, but that the property adjacent to the east is also zoned B-3. The transition strips are not required between business uses. Mr. Hayward stated that a detailed landscaping plan will be provided after basic site design issues are resolved. The landscaped area adjacent to the service road would be about 30' wide. This was found to be acceptable by the Commission.

Sanitation: Iacoangeli recommends that with the environmental issues present on the site and the proposed development size, it would be better to tie the property into the regional sewer system rather than having an on-site system. Takayama asked how the township would prevent further expansion of the sewer line down M-72. Hardin stated that the sewer district will likely expand across the B-3 zoned properties. Christopherson feels that a Zoning Ordinance amendment type process would be required to expand the sewer district. Corpe is trying to discover what the appropriate process will be, and noted that LochenHeath will be making a similar request that she hopes can be dealt with both concurrently and expeditiously. The Commission generally seemed to agree that serving this property with sewer if developed as proposed would be environmentally beneficial.

Parking Space Requirements: Iacoangeli is recommending that the parking space requirements be at 5 spaces/1,000 sq. ft. or less.

Location of Parking: If the Commission permits parking in front of the building as is common for this type of development, perhaps in exchange extra landscaping could be required. Hardin believes that the original idea of having parking behind buildings was to follow traditional development patterns where traveling down the street one views the building facades and not parked cars. David feels that the ordinance was written the way it was consciously, to say that the community prefers something better than the status quo. Mr. Stoepker asked where in the ordinance does it say that parking cannot be in a front yard? He read passages from Section 7.5, and noted that the rules regarding transition strips permit parking within them. Hull read Section 7.5.4(1) which allows the Commission and Board to grant exceptions from the requirement, but it states the requirement. Iacoangeli believes that in smaller types of development it is appropriate to have parking behind buildings that are close to sidewalks and the street, but that for a large grocery store it doesn't make sense. Carstens stated that a few years ago a car dealer thought about locating in the township, but was deterred by the township standing firm on requiring parking in the rear and not allowing the parking of display cars for sale out front. Iacoangeli believes that it would be inappropriate to ask people to walk more than a football field length to parking in the side or rear of the building. Hull and Corpe noted that "front" is defined as the side of the property where access is gained from the road. On a corner lot, if there are driveways on two roads a decision would have to be made.

Lighting: The applicant has asked for 32' tall metal halide lighting. Iacoangeli recommends a greater number of 22' poles. Mr. Hayward noted that for dark sky lighting the cutoff angle and lighting intensity are critical. Iacoangeli stated that there is a photometric plan for 1,000 watt metal halide lights in the application notebook. He recommends that the lights be recessed so that the bulb does not project below the cutoff shield. Corpe stated that this is in the zoning ordinance, as is a requirement for high-pressure sodium bulbs. Iacoangeli is concerned because high-pressure sodium distorts color perception and makes people feel less safe. Hull noted that the light rays emanating from the sodium lights are shorter-wave than other types, and can be more easily filtered out by astronomers and dark sky users. Iacoangeli recommended looking at switching the ordinance away from a high-pressure sodium requirement for better design.

Krause expressed concern that locating shorter poles in the islands will cause all of the light cast to be absorbed by the required trees. Mr. Hayward indicated that the applicant would be concerned with shorter lights because it would interfere with the landscaping and there would be more of them. At Eastwood there are 32' fixtures on 3' bases, metal halide, designed to have low light bounce-back from the pavement. He asserted that a 32' light complies with dark sky requirements, and that since the Meijer site is somewhat lower than the M-72 roadway, the bulbs will not be exposed to view by cars. Mr. Hayward feels that light should be scaled to use, with taller lights in parking lots and shorter lights in pedestrian areas. Iacoangeli again recommended a maximum 22' pole height. Mr. Hayward agreed to work up a second photometric design for comparison purposes. Hull stated that the same type of fixture from different manufacturers can have different light trespass results, and that the maker of the lights should be a consideration as well.

Architectural Materials: Iacoangeli believes that once a broader-based vision for a village is established, it would typically have design standards. All of the development would have the same character. The materials used in this facility may dictate recommendations for materials in the balance of a village development. He recommends consistency between the 2, although we don't know what the standards for the Village would be yet. In any event, he recommends that any area exposed to public view not contain visible pre-cast concrete. He also noted that Meijer is proposing one long, straight façade; he recommends that there be some architectural relief to provide texture and that this is a standard practice nationally for big-box development. Hardin noted that the Meijer façade proposed for the Village is very different from the one proposed now, even though the floor plan is essentially unchanged and there hasn't been a long passage of time. Mr. Hayward stated that Mr. Nowakowski is amenable to some minor architectural touches, but that Meijer has been criticized for its variety of architectural design instead of having one standard design that is unique and readily identifiable by the public as a representation of the brand.

Carstens has read about communities requiring large stores to be developed as a series of smaller units, so that if they are vacated it is easier to fill them again with new stores. Krause stated that this creates an insurmountable inconvenience for shoppers. Morgan suggested a façade that appears to be a series of separate buildings with different architectural elements. Mr. Stoepker stated that in most downtowns there are no significant deviations from a flat plane of facades, and Iacoangeli noted that Meijer's one foray into this area was largely seen as a failure.

A recess was declared from 9:03 to 9:15 p.m.

Vermetten noted a comment by Hardin that the design of the façade bears little relation to the layout of the store interior. Vermetten displayed the proposed design for the Meijer when it was going to be within the Village, noting that one thing people seemed to agree upon was that it was a fairly desirable design. Krause and Morgan still felt that it was a little too unbroken; Iacoangeli stated that the design looks better on paper than it does in real life. Mr. Hayward pointed out that the picture Vermetten displayed was from the current application; the proposed Village design has never been built. Mr. Hayward stated uncertainty as to where the ordinance permits the township to dictate architecture, but stated that Mr. Nowakowski is willing to bring the question of returning to the proposed Village design back to his company.

Gas Station: The initial market study said that a new gas station could not be supported by the market. The revised market study says the area can support four

new ones. Iacoangeli is uncertain as to whether or not having a gas station on the corner where one enters the heart of Acme is the image the township wants to convey. Mr. Stoepker stated that there are gas stations incorporated into the main street in Holland, and that to say they can't fit into a traditional development seems silly. He referred to the ordinance regarding planned shopping centers, reading the section stating that if a gas station is part of such a development it must be at the boundary of the development where it is away from pedestrian circulation and has "unencumbered access to the thoroughfare." Iacoangeli observed that "boundary" and "corner" are not synonymous.

Krause stated that during the 1999 Meijer application Mike Kinstle from Meijer agreed to angle the gas station in relation to the corner and to surround it by landscaping and berming to screen it. Mr. Hayward asked if returning to that specific design would make the gas station acceptable. Krause noted that if there is to be a car wash, it should be an expansion of the gas station area and shouldn't be crammed in too tightly. Sherberneau stated that a sign could be combined with an angled, bermed approach. Mr. Hayward stated that Meijer will not object to "dressing up the site." They do want the gas station to be located on the corner rather than interior to the site or along Lautner Road where traffic counts are lower. Morgan noted the proximity of other gas stations; Vermetten negatively likened that concern to prohibiting a McDonalds because a Burger King is present. Takayama noted that the site is environmentally sensitive and may be inappropriate for a gas station. Chris DeGood, Gourdie Fraser, referred the Commission to page 11 of a letter responding to the May 23 Ball Environmental report. He stated that Meijer has a good record for creating and managing underground gasoline storage systems and accidental spill collection systems which are detailed in the letter. Iacoangeli agreed that a number of safety measures are identified, but this does not change the fact that the tanks would be located in an area of hydric soils and high water table. He compared it to the idea of putting a swimming pool in an area with high water tables – both would essentially float in the ground and if not strapped down would pop out of the ground. The potential for concern on this particular site should not be taken lightly; nor should the original market study saying that the market area cannot support another gas station. There are many sites where there are gas stations that are not located at a corner or along the roadway but are internal to the site by as much as half a mile.

On the 1999 site plan the building was moved diagonally away from the immediate corner in a southeasterly direction. A proposed curb cut just east of Lautner Road on M-72 would be right only, and there may be concerns about a need for double left turn lanes. It might be better for stacking and queuing to move the facility closer to the internal area, if the gas station is desired at all. He felt it important to note that gas is not Meijer's core business, but is an ancillary service. Mr. Hayward addressed the market study, stating that it should not be treated as black and white but as an indication as to whether or not a use would be injurious to an area. In Eastwood the Sam's Club has a gas station along the main boulevard into the development. They did as much as they could to "dress it up." This is a community that is recognized as a "cool city" and has received historic preservation status, and he stated that grant money has been received to further improve the gas station appearance. Iacoangeli countered that if a market study is to be used to determine what uses would be injurious to existing properties, adding a gas station when the market study says that one is not supportable injures the existing facilities. Mr. Hayward replied that individual stations would lose market share, but overall market competition would be improved.

Motion by Vermetten, support by Carstens to continue discussion of the Lautner Commons application at the August meeting, by which time discussion

this evening should be incorporated into a revised site plan presented for discussion.

Morgan believes that Krause's idea of continuing an esplanade through the center of a parking area would be attractive and help traffic flow.

Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Stoepker stated that market, traffic and environmental studies have been presented. If the site plan is being discussed, can it be assumed that those studies are satisfactory? The Commission replied that this is not the case. Mr. Stoepker is concerned about entering into site design that might be fruitless if the studies are found unacceptable. He would hope that feedback from MDOT, the Road Commission and other entities would be available for the meeting as well. If only the Meijer and possibly the gas station are being considered, the impacts would be considerably less than the Meijer plus outlots. The application has been outstanding since January. Iacoangeli stated his advice that the Commission not plan on making a recommendation on the plan at the August meeting. MDOT is not as concerned with the traffic generation figures and Syncro models as they are with the pattern of development on the site and how traffic flow will work. He recommends that the site plan be resolved before MDOT and the Road Commission are asked to offer their opinion. Mr. Stoepker objected based on the current administration's objections to the way that the studies were handled for the Village SUP. Mr. Hayward asked if the township is going to authorize MDOT to proceed with its review at this time, the township will not. Vermetten stated understanding of the "chicken and egg" nature of the problem.

3. Annual Election of Officers (Chairman, Vice Chairman, Secretary):

Motion by Hardin, support by Takayama to re-elect the current slate of officers for a new 1-year term of office. Motion failed by a vote of 3 in favor (Hardin, Sherberneau, Vermetten) and 5 opposed (Krause, David, Takayama, Carstens, Morgan).

Motion by Krause, to nominate Vermetten as Chairman. Vermetten declined, stating that he cannot make the time commitment required to serve the township appropriately.

Motion by David, support by Vermetten to nominate Sherberneau as Chairman. Motion carried by a vote of 6 in favor (David, Hardin, Takayama, Sherberneau, Vermetten, Krause) and 2 opposed (Carstens, Morgan).

Motion by Krause, support by Hardin to nominate Vermetten as Vice Chairman. Motion carried by a vote of 6 in favor (David, Hardin, Sherberneau, Vermetten, Krause, Morgan) and 2 opposed (Carstens, Takayama).

Motion by Vermetten, support by David to nominate Krause as Secretary. Motion carried by a vote of 7 in favor (David, Sherberneau, Vermetten, Krause, Morgan, Carstens, Takayama) and 1 opposed (Hardin).

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

Gene Veliquette feels that the Commission has done a disservice to Meijer. There was discussion and argument about each issue, but there was not a vote on each one. There was a motion at the end saying that they should have a clear understanding of the direction and desires of the Commission, but this may not be the case. Mr. Veliquette also questioned why Jim Christopherson is here on behalf of the township. In the past it seems that he was derided

as “a joke” and was fired by the township. It seems like the township will return to following his recommendations to the old board regarding the Village within 6 months. The message to Meijer could be clearer. Mr. Veliquette finds it ironic that Long Lake is thinking about a moratorium on all development just to stop a church. He feels it is unfair to township taxpayers when they don’t know what to expect they will be able to do with their property and when a Commission doesn’t do it’s job. Perhaps Long Lake will be successful in banning churches, and Acme will be successful at banning capitalism...two things that make America great. He believes that “good faith” is lacking in the way the township operates, especially if no votes are taken following discussion on an issue where there has been divided discussion. One judge says that one sentence in an ordinance is illegal, and the whole ordinance is thrown out. Another judge says that the township can turn down anything if it doesn’t meet the Master Plan description of a “Suttons Bay” or “Elk Rapids.”

Meeting adjourned at 9:58 p.m.