FRANKFORT PLANNING COMMISSION – REGULAR MEETING
Meeting Minutes
April 28, 2009

Call to Order: 7:00pm.
Roll Call – Present: Ogilvie, Johnson, Clingman, Hommel, Duncan, McLaughlin, and Josh Mills.
Absent: Condon, Martin
Public: Norma Elias, Fred Stransky, Pat Haugen, Susanne Glynn, Pat Storrer (Council members), Alma House and Chip Smith
Quorum present

Approval of Minutes
None received...will address at the Regular Planning Commission meeting of May 12, 2009
Chair Ogilvie provided his notes of Executive Committee Meeting of April 20, 2009

Approval of Agenda
Moved Duncan, seconded Johnson, to approve agenda. **Motion passed**.

Public Input-General Items: None
Recognition of Frankfort City Council Members: Ogilvie asks if Council members have any input at this time...
Elias: In the Draft Assessment, the map update looks much better and clearer to read. Before it was difficult to tell the differences (between the various sections).
Stransky: Since this is a joint meeting, I would like to ask that Council be allowed to participate when desired.

Request to Appear:
Charles Smith, AICP, Senior Planner and Project Manager for Wade Trim Planning Consultants
Reporting on the Assessment of the City's current Master Plan '98, Five Year review, Build out Analysis and Recommendation of Wade Trim for the utility value of the existing Master Plan.

1. **Revised Draft of Frankfort Master Plan Assessment, Build-Out Analysis, Part 1**

Discussion
Smith: Pointed out differences in maps for better clarity. No changes made to original Draft report...Identifies need to address steep slopes, especially in targeted northern tier for development. Current Master Plan addresses this area for a conventional-type subdivision. Full Residential Build-out at current zoning would add 612 new dwellings to the current 874
Glynn: Could I question your figures? How did you arrive at those figures? Are 'residents' full time or summer? I believe almost half our homes are summer residences.
Smith: We haven't been able to pin down the number of year 'round residences. These figures are really meant to address spatial references, not social. So the question, how do we attract more year round residents?
Elias: I'm glad to see the reference to steep slopes and that's 12%-15%, right?
Smith: Yes. So to summarize the Build-out analysis, we realize the sense of place is important. The Build-out Map provides a potential view of Frankfort sometime in the future if the City were to become fully developed with the current zoning.
McLaughlin: Could you please go through the summary again? In reality, full build-out not feasible....
Smith: Yes, that's is the conclusion.
Storrer: I think the question of population is strictly related to units, not residents. (Is that) Correct?
Smith: Yes, our program created a logical pattern of dwellings.

2. **Revised Draft of Vision Fair and Public Input Report, Part 2:**

Discussion
Smith: In the Vision Fair, we were able to ask the question “what do you value” and found there were many similarities in the community's vision. Based on a 'postcards' exercise, we were able to come up with the basic principals in this statement...”The City of Frankfort is committed to providing remarkable quality of life for a diverse group of residents and businesses that reflects the City's small town sense of community and unique

physical and cultural character while creating a City that is economically, environmentally and culturally sustainable." Public input has increased to over 170 surveys, which represents approximately 10% of the populations. Interestingly, Frankfort agrees on growth, realizing our economic life is tied to population density. The environmental aspects of living in Frankfort are very important. To residents. Residents recognize the need for some kind of regional planning to protect both the Bay and the residents for sustainability of the areas vibrancy.
Ogilvie: In Pat Storrer's report of the Hearings we held last year, how did we do in comparison to what was the outcome of the Vision Fair?
Smith: Somewhat limited. In my sampling of the information some of the public input is backed up, some not. How we view planning is constantly re-evaluating. We change procedures and focus on different aspects while keeping the basic guidelines there. Remember, a decision to do nothing, is still a decision. We (Wade Trim) think it is prudent for the City to re-evaluate your Master Plan.

3. State Required Five-Year Master Plan Review:
Discussion
Smith: Michigan Municipal League's four questions to ask when considering your Master Plan:

Have there been major changes in the community not anticipated in the Master Plan?
Has the Planning Commission departed from the Master Plan?
Are the goals and policies of the Plan still relevant?
How does the future land use map compare with zoning actions taken since the Plan was adopted?

Given these questions and what we (Wade Trim) found, we are recommending a complete re-write of the City's Master Plan. The current Land Use Statement needs to be concise and clear in its direction. The current Land Use Statement's lack of specific direction is what opens you up for lawsuits. Regionalism is missing from the current Land Use Statement. There much redundancy in the current areas of Infrastructure, Economic Development, and Tourism. These can be combined and better clarified to make more sense that is specific. Frankfort has a high quality of life standard. It is our job to maintain this. Master Plans are the best marketing tool a community has. There are competitive advantages to having a streamlined process for development. The best Master Plan shows graphics that clearly identify and aid understanding of what it seeks to portray. *Wade Trim's normal timeframe for a Master Plan is 12-15 months followed by zoning (ordinance development) in the following 15-24 months*. Why so long? The physical form of the community is very important.(sic)
Ogilvie: Just the difference in perceptions reported between when we started this process in January '08, and what we report in '09 shows how quickly a community will change its focus.
Duncan: Many empty homes in my neighborhood are not necessarily affordable by the people who want to live here.
Smith: Downstate, in the big cities, empty houses are being knocked-down, rather than fix them. What the Planning Commission needs to do is decide how to address the issue of "affordable housing". This will need to be discussed by the Planning Commission. The other issue being what will the market bear?.
Ogilvie: The Planning Commission could help this process rather than allow a real knee-jerk reaction to this issue as happens in other communities.
Smith: Most vibrant cities have a diversity of income and housing 'stock' available rather than literally knocking down houses as they do in some communities downstate.
Ogilvie: A greater diversity of housing stock ~~to~~ creates a more diverse community, able to provide better employment opportunities and school populations.
Smith: We definitely need a larger diversity in our communities. Urban areas usually have the diversity, not necessarily the housing, so we could influence that change here in Frankfort to anticipate this.
Glynn: The Benzie Housing Council works on the principal that 40% medium income constitutes affordable housing sector. That's how you get people into that the affordable housing market.
Duncan: … thinks planning commission should address population as it relates to schools, attendance boundaries and transportation … needs to be addressed in Day 1 meetings … if we are to keep schools.
McLaughlin: In my experience, it's usually those folks who have no housing issues that make determinations on affordable housing in communities. We will need to make an effort to bring folks in need of affordable housing into the planning of this for Frankfort.

4. **Differences between Michigan Municipal Leagues' Five Year Plan Outline and "Five Year Master Plan Review criteria and format outlined in the Land Use Series check List #1H developed bu MSU Land Use Team, October 8, 2008?"**

Smith: Speaking to the issue of format of the inquiry into the five-year plan review. Smith pointed out that the Michigan Municipal League (MML) outline was essentially the same as the MSU Land Use Series checklist referred to in the Frankfort Planning Commission RFQ of November 2008. That he relied on the MML format rather than the MSU Land Policy checklist #1H is more a matter of format rather than substance. He believes that which ever outline is employed the essential conclusion would be the same: Frankfort's Master Plan of 1998 does not meet the current desires of the citizens, and fails to address issues confronting the City today in numerous consequential and significant sections. That ten years have elapsed and significant changes occurred in that period, including the change in population demographics, requires the creation of Master Plan, Land Use Plan and directly related Zoning Ordinance to meet the expectations of the citizens, as expressed in the Vision Fair and Survey results received to date.
Ogilvie: If we employed the MSU Checklist, would we find any significant difference in conclusions? By adopting this part of the Wade Trim Report, the Planning Commission is being responsive to the State Mandated Requirement that Frankfort has accomplished its 5-Year Master Plan Review.
Smith: Yes, that is the case, the MML outline and our report meets the requirements of the Michigan Planning Enabling Act, 2008.

5. **Revised Proposal to extend Wade Trim Contract through May 2010.**

Discussion
Smith: In the potential agenda for our (Wade Trim) proposal, you'll see we've broken down the workshops into six different segments. We believe the Waterfront and Downtown districts are two areas that really affect everyone. We recognize the importance of outreach for the summer months and getting input from those residents. We also need to really look at school enrollment with the schools to see what impact that might have on the future. We're also going to be approaching Elberta and Crystal Lake Township as neighbors to Frankfort.
Elias: What does this 'Stakeholders' mean?
Smith: By invitation, special interest groups will be invited to discuss their parts of possible information that could be of interest in the future of Frankfort. By understanding their issues or upcoming projects, we'll have a better understanding of how these identified Stakeholders impact Frankfort, not decide what Frankfort will do.
Ogilvie: These would be the entities involved in the notification of the Master Plan, in any case.
Elias: I'm saying these meetings should be open to the public.
Smith: Let's take the example of the DPW staff; they might not say what they want to say if the Council was here.
Elias: I'm just saying the transparency of the City government needs to be upheld.
Smith: We will be marketing these as events with possible yard signs, as an example, to really work at getting people to participate.
Hommel: In other words, the stakeholders contact would be informational.
McLaughlin: What if the Stakeholder meetings were held in public places?
Elias: I used to be on the Planning commission and one time we thought we had worked out a perfect parking solution only to find out the community was very upset with us and we ultimately dropped the plan because the community felt so strongly about it.
Ogilvie: Let's talk about your proposal for consolidating the Master Plan and Zoning Ordinances processes. As I understand it, the Wade Trim proposal would be less expensive.
Smith: You could traditionally have the same set of meetings and Public Hearings for Master Plan and a year later need to repeat that for the Zoning Ordinance. This proposal tries to save the City money by doing both simultaneously.
McLaughlin: Have all Council and Planning Commission members seen the proposal?
Ogilvie: Some Planning commission members and all of the Council have had copies. Because this was a draft proposal, and had not been thoroughly reviewed by the City Superintendent, we did not hand it out to everyone. That was part of the purpose of the Executive Committee meeting of April 20, although it was never discussed, in light of the necessary review of the Draft Report that had been handed out to the public, City Council, and Planning Commissioners. That significant questions about the wording and illustrations of the build out analysis clearly dominated our discussion, resulting in this extra meeting with Wade Trim, we may now turn our attention to the Wade Trim proposal for the next twelve months. What must be clear from this report, our Master Plan has

significant holes. It's equally evident by combining both (Master Plan and Zoning) processes there will be an economic benefit to the City.
Smith: I estimate it would cost, in a range of, between $75,000-$150,000 if done separately. $50,000 if done together. I think consultants we got into the process of doing these separately when the economic times were better for municipalities. Consolidating the process, reducing the costs and reducing the period, we will result in (you (the city) to be happy with the results.
McLaughlin: Given our earlier discussion about the change in focus from the '08 to '09 discussions, let's not try to fast track this process.
Smith: The community needs to see an end to the process otherwise you'll lose their support if Planning & Zoning is stretched out too much.
Storrer: Given the concern of this process being too fast, we must remember there is the five-year review that would allow the City to make easy changes, in the future, if it determined this was necessary.
Smith: Those changes could be simple if it was determined through a community dialog there was a need for some changes. There are some things that are going to need to be tweaked, no doubt.
Ogilvie: What else can Wade Trim do for us?
Smith: Josh has done the Coastal Zone Management (CZM) grant and Wade Trim could assist with other grants that we know of, but aren't common knowledge. Wade Trim maintains a department of people working on discovering and applying for grants.
Josh: I'm going to be dealing with the separation application for the next CZM grant and Chip has given me some good ideas as to how to proceed with that part of the grant.

New business

1. **Motion to adopt, adopt with modifications, adopt with amendments, or reject, the submitted Five Year Master Plan Review as required by the Michigan Planning Enabling Act, as submitted by Wade Trim.**

The Motion to adopt the submitted Five Year Master Plan Review as required under Michigan Planning Enabling Act, as provided in the Wade Trim Report, Moved by Johnson, seconded by Duncan.
Discussion:
Ogilvie: In going through this process, we have fulfilled the State Requirement as set forth in Public Act 33.
Stransky: As a member of the Finance Committee, I would be interested to know what the Planning Commission has spent to date.
Ogilvie: $13,360
Josh: We've been paying out from one grant (CZM).
Stransky: Documentation of the initial phase 1 Budget would be most helpful in our financial deliberations.
Josh: It is all part of the grant.
No further discussion.
All Ayes. Motion passed.

2. **Motion extending thanks to Michele Larson for service to Planning Commission. Moved Bruce, seconded Hommel. Motion passed.** Attached letter read into the minutes.

Public Input – Agenda Items only.
Pat Storrer, 424 Corning: What will the next steps for the Planning Commission and the City Council be in this process?
Ogilvie: Next step will be undertaken in our Regular Meeting, May 12th.

Moved Hommel, seconded Johnson, to adjourn meeting. Motion approved.
Meeting adjourned at 8:45pm.

Next Meeting: Regular Meeting Tuesday, May 12, 2009 7:00pm