

Columbia Township Planning Commission Minutes

Columbia Township
8500 Jefferson Road , Brooklyn, Michigan 49230

The Meeting of April 24, 2001 at 7:30 pm.

Meeting called to order by Chairperson in Charge Donald Watkins.

Members Present: Holmstrom, Gaede, Wahr, Parker, Kuzminski & Watkins

Absent : May

Motion by Wahr to accept agenda, seconded by Gaede. Motion Passed.

Motion by Wahr to accept public comment & meeting procedures, seconded by Gaede,
Motion Passed.

Motion by Wahr to accept last meeting minutes, seconded by Holmstrom. Motion passed.

The Seven Bros (aka Dunigan)/ Clark Lake Condo Project Hearing started. Chairperson Watkins opened & quoted current ordinance rules to what is allowable under present zoning for the two parcels of land in question.

(Descriptions 19-16-351-001-12 and 19-16-351-001-01 on or attached to Eagle Point Drive)

Bob Layton spokesperson for the Seven Bros. Presented this clients' proposal of development to the commission & audience. Greg Presley, project architect further reviewed the type of construction & overview of the Project.

Dennis Hurst legal representative for some of the residents opposed to this project ,as Point of Argument questioned whether the Public Notification which was originally in error should be grounds for delaying this meeting. (Chair person Watkins later in the meeting provided the corrected Notification Dates)

Loretta Baker 2230 Elizabeth Court was first to speak supporting the passage of the Project.

Petition by the general citizens 'at large' were received by the Commission for the record asking for a 'no-vote' on this project.

Dr. Jack Bentley 1446 Eagle Point did support the Seven Bros efforts to develop the site(s) but asked for consideration in reduction in density or what he said should be "Plan B" or an alternate plan.

Myra Breakey 14041 Eagle Pt. was concerned about the 'reduction' number of boat launches by the developer and how is would it not be a true indicator of reduction & not actually 'reduce' the total number of boats on the lake.

Doris Cadwallader 764 Lakeview expressed concerns about overburdening existing roads & sewer capacity .

Dennis Hurst 1452 Eagle Point expressed his opinions pertaining to a 'no vote' as well as reflecting on again the alledged mis print in the public notification process. Chair person Watkins denied any reconsideration.

Ann Clarke 1720 Eagle Point asked that Dan Burich, Supervisor be excluded from the Township Board Vote, being that he currently owns 10 acres in the area & that would be a conflict of interest.

Brad Latvaitts 1240 Eagle Pt. Expressed concern in the following areas: Water Wells, Aquafier Capacity, Safety concerns with the existing gasoline fueling station, seawalls,sewers & noise during construction.

Arnis Schieder 8858 N. Shore supported the project saying it would bring in tax dollars while at the same time

Would minimize outsiders (non-residents) who cause the problems around the lake.

Spencer Maidlow 1000 Eagle Point asked for further consideration for less density that would be something that both sides could agree upon. He went on to say that this type of development is needed considering the current state of the properties.

R Shawnacer 1440 Eagle Pt followed with the concern over density and voiced that maybe things would go better with a revised plan with less density.

George Vinson 5570 N Shore supported this project.

Elise Fish 1029 Eagle Pt was concerned about the density and the 'storage bldgs' that would adjoin this property line.

Byran Fish same address expressed his opinion of the 'condo issue' and how it relates to the neighborhood.

Kellie Garris 1416 Eagle Pt. Reflected on the zoning classification and how it doesn't fit in the neighborhood. Also voiced concerned that the previous presentation statements how the proposed condo assoc. accountable for resident/neighborhood issues would be non-existent.

Jill Bentley 1501 Cottage expressed concern over density, sewer & aquafiler

Pete Swaker 1090 Eagle Pt was concern over density.

End of Public Comments.

Commission Discussion. Wahr expressed her view of 'what was too much density for the site?' For a six acre site, considering Low, Moderate & High Density numbers, is six units per acre low, while 12 is moderate and 18 is high? How does one determine the role of low, moderate & high pertaining to this site? Gaede expressed similar views.

Kuzminski asked the claimants if they would consider reduction is number of units on the back lot. A representative stated that would consider going from 9 duplexes to 8. After further concerns, Kuzminski asked if they would consider 7 duplexes.

An intermission was announced.

Returning to the meeting, it was decided that the Commission did not have the authority to amend this vote tonight, the purpose of the Commission tonight was to only approve or disapprove the overall project. With that in mind, the claimants stated they also could not consider such a amendment without fiscal review, but it would be reevaluated before bringing it to the site approval meeting. ^{Gaede 5/8/01} Chairperson Watkins suggested that they compile a density study on the present neighborhood and consider 'matching that number in the equation of their density site plan.

Kuzminski clarified to the audience that the vote tonight would be only on the rezoning and the actual decisions on density would be evaluated at the site plan meeting later.

Roll Call: YES Holmstrom, Gaede, Kuzminski, Watkins

No Parker, Wahr

Motion Passes.

Overall Consideration in this passage. Polling the commission member who voted Yes, if the claimants were flexible in reduction in the density issue that local residents number one concern was with, these member believed a compromise could be later agreed upon at the site approval meeting.

Meeting Adjourned

Sec. Ray Kuzminski