

FRANKFORT PLANNING COMMISSION – REGULAR MEETING
Meeting Minutes
May 12, 2009

Call to Order: 7:00pm.

Roll Call – Present: Ogilvie, Hommel, Clingman, Condon, Duncan, and McLaughlin

Absent: Johnson, Martin, and Josh Mills

Public: Pat Storrer (Council liaison), Norma Elias, Alma House. Mary L. Wichert, Phyllis Kullman, pim Dodge
Quorum present

Approval of Minutes

April 14, 2009 – Moved Clingman, seconded Condon, to approve the minutes, as presented. Ayes: All. Nays: None. Motion approved.

April 28, 2009 - Moved Hommel, seconded Clingman, to approve minutes, as presented. Ayes: All
Nays: None Motion approved.

April 20, 2009 – Chair's notes from Executive Committee Meeting, presented

Approval of Agenda

Moved McLaughlin, seconded Condon, to approve agenda. **Motion passed.**

Public Input-General Issues

None

Request to Appear:

Steve Campbell, for Citizens group proposing Trailhead Building at Father Charleviox Park

Discussion

Campbell: We are a group of citizens proposing the development of a Frankfort Beach Trailhead facility in Cannon Park. This is a way to enhance the facilities at the beach area for visitors and residents, tied into the Trail, with the beach being the natural starting and ending of the Trail. This gives us an opportunity to make a nicer beach area. Our proposal places the Trailhead where the cannon currently resides. The cannon would become the focal point of the park in the front corner where the Community Support Wall is. This area would be cordoned off with picnic tables going in for seating and relaxing. A center post would be added on Michigan Ave. for a pedestrian crossing. Safety is very important. Design of the building is very architecturally pleasing and in keeping with the surrounding building designs, much like City Hall. There is also a proposal to include a little snack stand to service the beach goers, something that's very common around the country. Our goal was to bring this to the public for discussion and through the process of public input, the list of wants may change. In the eyes of some, the current facility lacks appeal and looks like an outhouse. We think we can offer something much better. Our goal would be to fund this through private donations, grants, and foundation contributions. We've gotten some support from the Friends of the Betsie Valley Trail and some other organizations.

Condon: It appears to eliminate the area where the teenagers like to hang out and there's some traffic issues there at the turnaround, right?

Campbell: We would actually only lose a few parking spaces there and it would help with the crosswalk, too. There could also be some beneficalians from having a marked trailway and completed bike path. Josh had also talked about some enhancements to the porta-pottie area with a structure to cover and adding some shrubs. We appreciate the support of the Commission to help us along in this process.

Ogilvie: Just to make this clear, you have made this presentation to the Recreation Board?

Campbell: Yes

Ogilvie: At least twice that I'm aware of. You had some kind of interest from them, in regards to the Trailhead activity, to see if Frankfort has something similar to what Elberta is doing.

Campbell: Yes. There was some separation in the views of whether the Trailhead should be here or somewhere around 10th St. the restroom facility came first, in the concept, and we decided why limit this project to just that. There could be an opportunity for Visitor Information, places for bikers to fill their water bottles, a place to just relax and link the Trail and the beach.

Clingman: Who decides what's inside or what the design of the Trailhead will be?

Campbell: We'll present our plan for public input. The ideas are just ideas. Nothing is set in stone. The key factors would be the restrooms.

Ogilvie: The Recreation Board chose to send a positive note back to the Planning Commission for their consideration. In that manner, we're going to take responsibility to move this forward and I'll talk about this in some detail, later on.

Duncan: Do you have a rough idea of what something like that might cost?

Campbell: We're currently estimating between \$200,000 and \$300, 000.

McLaughlin: If the Planning Commission were to send this on to the Council and the Council approved a referendum, would this group be interested in assisting with those costs?

Campbell: Very likely.

Condon: It's a great location for the Chamber.

Clingman: Could you please tell us what you propose to do with the old bathrooms?

Campbell: Our desire would be to move much of those out to the 7th St. Beach.

Clingman: And who's responsible for that cost?

Campbell: If the City determined that would be a good plan, we'd look at the cost of dismantling and moving and perhaps the City would be able to assist with that cost. The current bathroom out there is pretty beat up. But those details would need to be worked out.

Chair Report

1. Wade Trim Proposal for Contract Extension & Zoning Ordinance creation process

Hand outs of proposal given Commission members, discussion to continue under New Business

2. Updates of Planning Commission Roster

Proper contact information requested with terms indicated

3. Notification of Michigan Citizen Planner Academy conference, June 25, 2009, "Placemaking for Prosperity: Practical Education in the New Economy" , MSU

Limited budget for possible attendees

City Superintendent's Report

Copies of the recently submitted Coastal Zone Management (CZM) grant (II) were made available to the Planning Commission members for a total of \$42,500 for the completion of the Master Plan, Zoning Ordinances and the digital mapping of the City. CZM expressed great support of the City's efforts in these endeavors.

Discussion

McLaughlin: I see the virtual model is a component of this grant.

Ogilvie: Yes, they (CZM) expressed a great deal of interest in this. I will be speaking to this as we discuss under New Business.

Zoning Board of Appeals – No report

Old Business- None

New business

1. Motion to discuss the Wade Trim assessment of the 1998 Master Plan, as requested, dated January 20, 2009. Motion made by McLaughlin, seconded by Condon.

Discussion

Ogilvie: Has anyone come up with any additional items that need to be reviewed or corrected? Is there any wording or language that causes you concern?

Elias, 107 Park St.: I think the color changes are very helpful to differentiate between the areas. Before the shading and colors were so close to one another, it was difficult to tell the differences. My concern over the previous choice of description in that one area (Betsie Bay) was due to our ongoing litigation with Mr. Tobin. I

believe if this hadn't been corrected it could have caused some problems with the case and we need to be very clear, particularly in this area. I believe this clears it up.

Ogilvie: No further language or color issues? After reading and re-reading this, I can find no further issues to address.

Storrer: Draft, draft, draft...Are we ever going to be a "final" copy?

Ogilvie: According to what I was told earlier this afternoon, it's supposed to be in the mail.

Duncan: Do you need a vote from us?

Ogilvie: I would like to wait until we have a final copy so I'm suggesting a motion to table until we have the final copy.

Motion made to table, until we receive the final report, by Duncan, seconded McLaughlin. Ayes: All
Nays: None **Motion passes.**

2. Motion to Approve, Approve with amendments, or Deny the Wade Trim proposal

Motion made to discuss the Wade Trim proposal by Clingman, seconded by McLaughlin. Ayes: All Nays: None **Motion passes.**

Discussion

Ogilvie: I was hoping to have a final proposal for discussion but we have not yet received a copy of this. It was to have said essentially, '...with these exceptions of grant writing assistance...' That is going to be changed in some fashion. We're going to see estimated fees reduced, in some fashion (see page 6). That is going to be substantially trimmed.

Condon: So we can't vote on this?

Ogilvie: No, but we can talk about it. We actually have an opportunity to review and discuss the proposal, as my outline indicates. We need to have a better understanding of what they are proposing. Thank you, Pat Storrer, for attempting to make sense out of all the various components of the Wade Trim proposal's timelines. The Master Plan/Zoning Ordinance phases, starting with the notices of Intent to Update our Master Plan, to all surrounding communities and appropriate entities. The intent is that anybody who might be touched by this City's process is informed.

Storrer: Given the work that's being done by the Grand Vision, would they be a part of this process?

Ogilvie: There's no formal standing with the Grand Vision but certainly as participants, we would want to keep them informed.

Elias: I have a question, is this proposal for the \$50,000 the entire package, including surveys?

Ogilvie: Yes. It's my understanding we have now received about 230 total surveys.

Storrer: We'll be able to review the workshop schedule from Wade Trim and make changes as we see fit?

Ogilvie: That's right, nothings been cast in stone just yet. The summary that Pat put together helps us to better understand the phases that we originally talked about.

Ogilvie: Now, when you go to budget items, we originally thought the assistance of a consultant in this process would be helpful and we obtained a budget for \$38,000 and so far we've spent \$13,360 so far and that leaves us with some extra money there. With Wade Trims proposal to combine both the Master Plan effort and the Zoning Ordinances working on them simultaneously to the cost of \$50,000, compared to the original budgeted \$161,000 that's quite a difference. So the question becomes are we willing to be guinea pigs to find out if they can actually pull off this ambitious plan of approach?

McLaughlin: As Mr. Smith pointed out in our April 28th meeting, that once we have a contract, they are bound to that no matter how long it takes to accomplish. So I think that's the answer to that question.

Condon: So far our experience with Wade Trim has been very efficient and on time.

Storrer: We also have the in-kind contribution of the volunteer time of the Planning Commission members and City employees to keep in mind.

Ogilvie: So we have the \$10,000 allocated by the City and the first CZM grant for \$25,000, allowing us \$35,000 total. Adding a contingency of \$10,000, we could look at a total outlay of \$73,000. We have funding, to date, of \$57,000 and that leaves \$42,500 which is CZM grant number II, that's the cash piece. That means we will have to come up with an additional cash outlay or in-kind contribution of some of that. The bottom line is at this point, I'm confident we can bring this in at or significantly under budget.

McLaughlin: Will the Council be looking at the Water/Sewer Enterprise fund in their budget deliberations?

Condon: I thought Josh said that was money already ear-marked.

Storrer: Josh has emailed me that this is included in the budget and if need be there can be a budget amendment.

Duncan: I'm confused, it seems the budget is quite a bit larger than what we're coming up with.

Ogilvie: Yes, but remember our priority list was based on a model of going through the Master Plan process and then following with the Zoning component, a year or so later and basically repeating some of the same tasks all over again. We're trying to cut through that time period. Josh has already determined the CZM will accept the Water/Sewer Enterprise dollars will suffice as matching dollars for the CZM grant.

Elias: That would actually be a Council decision to make.

Ogilvie: Correct.

McLaughlin: Do we know the answer to the estimated costs for our Zoning Attorney's review of the Zoning Ordinances?

Storrer: No.

Motion made to table by McLaughlin, seconded Condon. Ayes: All Nays: None Motion passes.

3. Motion to recommend City Council deliberation of proposed Beach-to-Beach Trailhead in Cannon (Father Charlevoix) Park.

Discussion

Ogilvie: The Recreation Board has unanimously voted to give the Planning Commission an opportunity to move this discussion forward. In consulting with the Zoning Attorney, we cannot make a determination of the use of public lands as proposed by the Citizens group. We don't have that authority. We have two models to work off of...the Coast guard Station, leased to Crystal Lake Art Center, paying no City taxes. Should the Art Center pull out of the lease, the property reverts back to the City's responsibility. Second, the Lions Club, which also reverts back to the City, The City has no operating liability for either structure as long as both parties are using these spaces. It would seem a recommendation to the City Council for this to be put on the November ballot would be in order.

Motion to send this issue on the City Council for their deliberations to go on the November ballot, by Condon. Seconded by Duncan. Ayes: All Nays: None Motion passes.

Public Input – Agenda Items only. None

Alma House, 221 Michigan Ave.: I'd like to know who is in this citizens' group? I would like to see a list of names. Who are they representing? In coming to a vote of the people, are they just going to vote on the use of the land, the building...just what will they be voting on?

Ogilvie: It's going to be on the use of the land. We will hold a Public Hearing prior to the vote.

Storrer: Having raised a lot of questions about the Wade Trim proposal, can we say we'd like to have the information back by a certain date and call a Special Meeting to discuss, before we make a recommendation to the City Council?

Ogilvie: Yes.

Elias: It may be that we call a Special meeting of the Council, just to get going on it. There's a lot of consideration here and I'm anxious to get going on it.

**Moved Duncan, Condon seconded, to adjourn meeting. Motion approved.
Meeting adjourned at 8:11pm.**

Next Meeting: Regular Meeting, Tuesday, June 9th, 7:00pm