

FINAL
CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF COMMERCE
*****SPECIAL*** PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

Monday, December 13, 2021
2009 Township Drive
Commerce Township, Michigan 48390

A. CALL TO ORDER: Vice Chairperson Parel called the meeting to order at 6:00pm.

ROLL CALL: Present:

Brian Parel, Vice Chairperson
Brian Winkler, Secretary
Chelsea Rebeck
Bill McKeever
George Weber
Sam Karim
Joe Loskill

Also Present:

Dave Campbell, Township Planning Director
Paula Lankford, Asst. to the Planning Director
Jill Bahm, Partner, Giffels Webster
Larry Gray, Township Supervisor
Mark Gall, Township Fire Marshal

B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION by Weber, supported by Loskill, to approve the Special Planning Commission Meeting Agenda of November 22, 2021, as presented.

Discussion took place regarding procedures for the Special Meeting.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None. (Nov. 1st & 22nd meeting minutes will be reviewed at the regular meeting on Dec. 13th at 7:00pm)

D. UPDATE OF ACTIVITIES

None.

E. PUBLIC DISCUSSION OF MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None.

F. TABLED ITEMS

None.

G. OLD BUSINESS

None.

H. SCHEDULED PUBLIC HEARINGS:

None.

I. NEW BUSINESS:

11. MASTER LAND USE PLAN REVIEW

Work session of the 2015 Master Land Use Plan review.

David Campbell – We had our kickoff meeting on November 22nd. There were two takeaways from that meeting. One was that all of you were going to give some thought to what the guiding principles were going to be for this master plan review. The goal was to come up with a collective set of guiding principles that the Planning Commission would take to a joint meeting with the Township Board, scheduled for January 25th. We hope to have a collective vision from the Planning Commission and get some consensus with the Township Board so that we move forward knowing that we have agreement.

The second of the two takeaways was that Jill Bahm was going to develop a survey for all of you to participate in, and I think as of today, all of you have done so. Part of what Jill will do is to go through those survey results with us. The hope was that the survey would help to establish these guiding principles.

Before I turn it over to Jill to go through the survey results, looking at the schedule, hopefully at our January 10th Planning Commission meeting, we can firm up this vision in anticipation of the joint meeting on January 25th.

Ms. Bahm – Thank you for participating in the survey. I think there was one respondent who either came back and finished under another response criteria, or just didn't want to participate in all of the questions, and that's fine. If you have other comments you want to share, we can add those in later or tonight.

I wanted to go over some of the highlights. As you'll see from the slide, for each question, we had 5 or 6 people respond on earlier questions. I think the strengths was probably the easiest one to answer because people like their community. We gave you three blank spaces and everybody participated by filling in each of those. I was not surprised to see; lakes, parks and open spaces rated the highest with eight responses. You're almost unanimous with that. I think every person who responded had one of their choices as that, so it's a critical note to make.

Several people noted the small town feel, and then a variety of other answers, including access to the freeway, unique businesses, infrastructure, favorable tax rates, the Township center area, and the residential character, which maybe could go with small town feel, and then the strong public school system.

Weaknesses; traffic was identified as a problem and it was also unanimous with everybody's responses. In addition, a lack of a defined town center, lack of non-motorized connectivity, apartments – one respondent noted transient vs. neighborhood development, communication, and the redevelopment of the Beaumont and Williams International sites.

For opportunities, these were really consistent with those strengths and weaknesses. Looking at housing and traffic as the two larger buckets, with housing encouraging home development over apartments, addressing the housing boom, and developing a balanced housing stock. With traffic, reducing congestion, maybe managing traffic a little better, and I included in this bucket the responses related to pathways and non-motorized connectivity, and one opportunity to develop a funded solution for the Union Lake corridor traffic.

Other buckets, which were smaller; maintaining open space, focused zoning on hometown feel for both residential and retail, sustainability, commercial redevelopment plan, and the Five & Main project. I kept that one separate from the other hometown feel response because I do think it was worth noting that Five & Main is identified as an opportunity.

In terms of threats, we had a lot of people, almost unanimous comments, on either overdevelopment or unbalanced develop. I know those are different, but I lumped them together because I think they're closely related. Thinking about the development of large parcels near the Union Lake corridor, rental and apartments development, compatibility with adjacent land uses, increased traffic, the loss of land and trees – again, thinking about that underneath the bucket of overdevelopment or unbalanced development. Also addressing climate change in future developments, which could go there or could stand on its own as a bucket of sustainability. And then again, funding for the Union Lake Road corridor.

When we talk about emerging issues and trends, a follow-up to our conversation that we had last month, there were 12 responses, including; sustainability, EV charging, traffic congestion and overdevelopment, looking at not only the aging population, but changing demographics as a whole, looking at retail and online trends and how that might play out in the future, especially with some of our more developed areas, and then, increased parks and preservation of natural features.

The 10-year vision, several people noted the reinforcement of a hometown or small town feel. I included the identifiable center there, the idea of the downtown area, that the community would be more walkable, and that the community would be sustainable with great green features and parks, there would be housing for all ages, and then this is my favorite – somebody said that *all of the traffic congestion is going to be resolved*, while someone else said, *all the traffic congestion is still going to be with us*. So, you're a little bit diverse on whether you're a pessimist or an optimist I guess.

In terms of the process, we suggested that there may be things we want to make sure we include in the master plan process. There were a variety of responses to this. It's a little bit harder to find complete agreement, but a lot of things that I think are worth noting. Consensus on a development direction for businesses and housing, traffic impacts and studying that, updating the zoning as needed, big box redevelopment strategies, commercial property maintenance provisions, public engagement, looking at natural resources, identifying the proper housing and commercial types, and improving pathways and connectivity, and identifying achievable goals rather than blue sky ideas that are not followed up on. I left that one in as it was written because I think that really gets to the idea of a master plan that has solid implementation strategies. I think that's important.

In the master plan components, we asked you to do some ranking. I sorted those by the ones that had the highest responses. Looking at the economy, healthy communities, affordable housing, neighborhoods, complete streets, non-motorized transportation, age-friendly communities, arts, culture and place-making, and sustainability and resiliency. Keeping in mind the scale and the number of people who voted, it shouldn't necessarily be that we don't care at all about sustainability and resiliency because compared to the economy, there weren't that many fewer responses, but those are weighted averages based on how everybody voted.

We wanted to take a look back at the 2015 plan and consider how well we have tackled a couple areas. We were really focused on housing and transportation. Most people felt somewhat well to very well that the community is providing for the housing options through the master plan, and one comment was that the area is affordable. An area for improvement is affordable for first-time homeowners, so that may be something that we need to consider as we go forward.

With respect to the older population specifically, the comment was, *significant senior housing projects and age-limited housing have helped meet this need*. That may be with

respect to specific senior housing, but I think it's worth noting that there are other opportunities to provide housing, and also provide for other needs of the aging population. So, thinking about transportation, aging in place, and some of the other items. There was a bit of variety in the responses on that one.

In terms of transportation, a little bit lower responses, and the comment, *Township has done well in some areas, not so well in others*. If we think about variety of transportation options, how we approach that may be something that we want to consider in the next master plan. Then again, for the older population specifically, and there were two comments. One was *People's Express*, and the second one was, *Recently implemented ride sharing opportunities, need expansion based upon demand*. That may be another area we want to address. A lot of the responses early on were reflecting the traffic congestion, and that kind of ties in with the idea of transportation being a little bit challenging, especially for older people in the community.

Thinking about whether the Township is an age-friendly community; a variety of responses there. There were only four responses to this one. The first was, *not enough transportation options in cluster developments who support those who can no longer drive*. One of you also noted that *there is good access to healthcare in the area, and there is some transportation, accessible retail and pharmacy*. Another comment was about *having senior housing or assisted living developments in the community, but noting too that we're working toward improving those things*. I think those are good things to note going forward.

The goals and objectives were sort of a mix as to whether or not those have been met, and whether those were sufficient in their direction to help with implementation. There were two comments there. One was about *the public input from 2004 which is outdated*, and that was included in reference to the 2015 plan. The other was about the idea of enforcing right location development; *finding the right spot for development, instead of development for development sake*.

Looking at key stakeholders, people that we want to make sure are included in the process; business owners, developers, neighborhood associations, the DDA, students, chamber of commerce, anchor institutions, social providers ... I think it's worth noting that students were indicated, thinking that was a good opportunity so we're trying to get a variety of cross-section of ages in the community.

We asked about strengthening or supporting development and redevelopment in our shared border areas with our adjacent communities. We had four responses to that, talking about cooperative planning, better understanding of our neighbors' master plans, similar building and zoning standards which can be helpful too, and then periodic information sharing. Summits between communities is a really great idea. Those might be things that we want to start incorporating into this process too.

The last question was, to what degree do Township residents have places to enjoy, experience and learn about arts and culture? On this one, everybody answered something different. One comment was, *we could do more for the arts*, and another said, *basically, the Library*. Some people feel it's sufficient, and some think there's room for improvement.

Lastly, there was space for open-ended comments, and there were none. As we think about and lead into a conversation about planning principles for the process, it's helpful to think about these as issues that we want to keep in mind as we go through the planning process, maybe touch points we can refer back to, to make sure that we're staying on track with the things that we identified as being important at the outset. I don't think that you need to have unanimous agreement on them, or their order, priority or

hierarchy, but I think you should have a good sense that, generally speaking, all of you feel that those are meaningful items to consider.

Just looking at the survey responses, I think generally a balanced development within the context of the Township's strengths, which includes small town/hometown feel, the capacity of the existing and planned transportation network, lakes, natural resources, open spaces, and focus on redevelopment of key parcels. Also with that, ensuring that all developments are of high-quality and provide a variety of housing, and needed commercial uses, and maintaining or defining community identity – the idea of a hometown, and also thinking about the idea of a downtown.

I have just one more, and then I'll turn it over to you. Improving non-motorized transportation and pathways, reinforcing the high value for natural resources, and creating a framework for sustainability practices. Some of those relate to previous slides, but some stand on their own as well. That was really all I had as a summary of the survey. It's an intro to get you jumpstarted into thinking about the guiding principles.

Chairperson Parel – One of the thoughts that I had; did the Trustees complete the survey?

Dave Campbell – We did not ask them to. I was actually going to ask the same question back to you and Jill as well, as to whether it would be a valuable exercise for the Trustees to do the survey as well.

Weber – I think there's value, at least prior to the meeting on January 25th, to have the rest of the Board do it. I think maybe for two reasons. One, to get their input prior to that meeting, but also two, the ability that we will have to compare the survey results to see if the general thinking of the Planning Commission is similar to that of the Board. Then obviously we can have a consolidated view. If we know we're starting off in a similar thought process, then I think it might make the agenda for the meeting on the 25th a little different.

Ms. Bahm – I think it would be a good opportunity to have the Township Board complete the survey, and to have separate results for that. To your point, that might help focus our attention if we see wildly different responses between the Township Board and the Planning Commission.

Chairperson Parel – I thought the survey was great. We talk about other stakeholders. Is there anyone else we would want input from?

Loskill – I was going to say we should get citizen's input as well. If this can be put out on the Township website, or the Facebook page, so we can get input, not only from the Trustees, but from the citizens of Commerce, I think that would be valuable input as well.

Dave Campbell – Is that something we do before or after a joint meeting with the Township Board?

Loskill – We've got a month.

Weber – Personally, I would think, after. I think between the Commission and the Board, we can have a broad framework of what it is, then we can dial in the survey.

Chairperson Parel – Unless something comes up from the community that neither group had thought of.

Rebeck – I would suggest if we do a community survey, to make those fill-ins as drop-downs instead, otherwise consolidating that amount of data will be really difficult and I don't think we'd be able to focus on the community's response.

Ms. Bahm – That's a good point.

Chairperson Parel – I'm open to either.

Dave Campbell – It's a great idea, it's just a question of timing.

Chairperson Parel – I don't think it's critical to get the community input prior to the joint meeting.

Weber – Some of that is, what's the process that we're going through to create the master plan. So, assuming there's a road map, where does the community input fit in to that roadmap?

Ms. Bahm – It really can vary by community. It depends on how engaged the community is and how engaged you'd like them to be in this process. I think as we do a kickoff, some of those questions ... the average resident may not have any idea, and they probably won't know too much about the 2015 master plan. However, they may be able to share their ideas about the strengths and weaknesses of the community, what they perceive as threats and opportunities. It could be helpful in informing the Township Board and the Planning Commission as you gather for that first kickoff meeting. On the other hand, you could also do it where Township Board and Planning Commission have come up with these items, and how much do you agree or disagree with that? If we say, these are our priorities, do you agree with that? That can help with refining the vision when it comes back to the Planning Commission. It would look like, here is what was discussed at the meeting, we took that information to the community and the community said ... *Yes, you are absolutely right about the traffic, and please do something about it. And, we would love to have a downtown area.*

When I have done this in the past, I do find in most cases, the Planning Commission and Township Board really tend to have a pulse on what the community is thinking. I would be surprised if their answers were wildly different than yours. It can be helpful if we say, here's where we're going with the outset of our master plan. What do you think? And the community can weigh in on that before you launch into your next steps. That way, they're not coming up with things completely out of the blue. They're starting with some of your thoughtful responses initially.

Dave Campbell – Of the two options that Jill has proposed, I would lean toward the latter, to have the Planning Commission and the Board establish a framework. I mentioned timing earlier. We're talking about a meeting on January 25th, and obviously we have a lot of holidays in between. I'm not sure how much public engagement we

would get with an online survey this time of year. This doesn't have to be the only meeting the Township Board and the Planning Commission have on this topic. I like the idea of the establishing a framework, and then going out to the public to see if there's thoughts on that framework.

Weber – I agree with that as well, but at some point in time, I do think we need to put a lot of thought into how we're going to get that community involvement. I don't think that just a survey or social media surveys are enough. In addition to that, I'd like to figure out all of the other avenues, and including a roundtable or workshop, or we have different ideas on walls and people actually get walked through a process; understanding that we generally don't get a lot of people coming to meetings. A little bit of feedback can be dangerous if it's only from a handful of people and it's not necessarily representative of the community. Then again, I think we have something to balance that in survey results, which I'm hoping will be a number of thousands, and not tens.

Ms. Bahm – This can be a nice way to get people interested. Keeping it short and concise, and letting people know that this is not their only opportunity, but they're coming in at the ground floor. We want them to provide their input now. Then, as we go through the process, there would be other opportunities. We can even ask in the survey initially, how would you like to be involved? Would you like to participate online? Would you like to come to a meeting? If we have a workshop, would you like to be invited? We can have a place for people to sign up. Do you have a list serve or an email for the Township?

Dave Campbell – No.

Ms. Bahm – We can make one for this. We can have that be a survey question and we'll just send you the responses so we can start building a list. If one of the options we want to do is a meeting toolkit, which is something we've only done a handful of times, but I think it's a really nice way to get more people involved at the hyper local level. We give people some meeting information, asking basic questions, help the facilitator understand what they're being asked to do, put it together in a package. Then, it goes out and someone could run it at their school, their neighborhood, their place of worship, they can go thru and run an hour meeting and provide that feedback back to us. It's a way to reach people where they are. It's a nice approach and might get some more interest. People tend to not care as much about what's happening on the other end of the Township as they do about what's happening down the street. Reaching folks there can sometimes reveal different responses.

Chairperson Parel – In talking about the online engagement, I'd be interested. Is it just a Facebook group? Do we have a group? How do you see that working?

Ms. Bahm – Do you have a Facebook page?

Loskill – Yes.

Ms. Bahm – Does it get used?

Loskill – Yes.

Dave Campbell – I keep looking at Paula because she's my social media consultant. I stay away from it as best I can.

Rebeck – There's a Commerce resident page too that we could share it on. It's a very active page.

Ms. Bahm – There could be other ways too. We typically do a project website, so that could be linked from the Township's website. It's a portal of information. We can put up meeting presentations and basics about what a master plan is. It's an educational component, and then we can add in different opportunities for people to participate. That can be one of the questions that we ask too. Do you know that the Township has a Facebook page? Do you ever use it? How else would you like to find out information? We can create an email list of participants and identify stakeholders that way.

Discussion of social media continued.

Rebeck – Is there any value in having a paper version of the survey here at the Township Hall for people who may not be active on social media?

Ms. Bahm – Yes, here and also at the Library, and the Richardson Center.

Chairperson Parel – It sounds like we have a method to get the survey out to the masses. Maybe we talk more about some of George's ideas, getting it out to more groups and engaging people.

Dave Campbell – Looking at the clock, we have a regular meeting at 7:00. I want to give us 10 minutes to get situated before that regular meeting. If the intent is to have a productive meeting with the Township Board on January 25th, and coming to them with a deliverable, I hope that by the January 10th Planning Commission meeting, we have a good idea of what that deliverable is going to be. Maybe I'll put Jill and Mr. Weber on the spot. I hope you all got a copy of what George prepared. Do we have any thoughts on what a deliverable would be for us to bring to the joint meeting with the Township Board to have a productive conversation with that group? So then we can go forward with this process knowing that there's a collective agreement on what this vision should be.

Ms. Bahm – Do you think the Township Board would be able to complete the survey before that meeting?

Dave Campbell – Before the 25th, or before the 10th?

Ms. Bahm – I think the 10th might be a little tough with the holidays.

Dave Campbell – Our Supervisor is sitting in the back. I think we can get them to do it.

Weber – We can discuss it tomorrow night and give them a homework assignment to get it done by the end of the year, and then we can send it out on Wednesday to the rest of the Board.

As far as deliverables, I think the first stake in the ground is that this is an update to the master plan. This is not a tear up and start over. We're taking the 2015 plan and we're doing our 5-year update to that.

Dave Campbell – We're doing a 5-year review, and it's up to the Planning Commission and the Township Board. Is it time to do an update? Or, is the 2015 master plan still what the vision is for the Township?

Weber – I think we have to answer that question. As we go through this process, if we say, these are stakes in the ground, based on our survey, and based upon the discussion we're going to have, are those themes or guiding principles that helped drive the 2015 plan still applicable? Or, have things changed and we want to update?

Dave Campbell – When I look at the 2015 plan, I think we're due for an update.

Weber – I would agree. There has been significant change, not only to what has happened in the Township, but based on the world we're living in right now.

Dave Campbell – Mr. Weber, you sent out this vision, mission and guiding principles model. In your mind, is this what a deliverable would be to the Township Board? In this format?

Weber – If you're asking about my PowerPoint skills and the format, it's questionable as you can tell. At a minimum, I think we should have a vision and guiding principles. Whether we want to throw a mission in there or not, we can solve that here internally. I think we need an overarching vision and then those 5 or 6 key things, which came out in the survey results to a great degree. As we're looking at the way we're zoned, and the developed and undeveloped properties, how do we send them through these filters of our guiding principles to see if the 2015 plan is valid, or whether it needs to be updated in those key areas and geographies? If that makes sense.

Chairperson Parel – It does.

Weber – Sam, I know you had mentioned that you have some extensive planning experience.

Karim – Yes, and I've shared some comments with you. I'm in favor of actually updating instead of starting with a new site plan. We are coming through changes, and some of those are because of COVID and a lot of people are working at home right now. Frankly, I don't know when it's going to end. If working at home will be a trend, or if we will get back and people will start moving from the community to go to work somewhere else.

We do know that we have congestion. Everybody knows Martin Road gets packed completely, and that is a main route to go to Commerce Township. I mentioned in the comments, I lived in east Commerce Township, very close to Milford. When I needed bread, I had to drive over 20 minutes. If I needed meat, it was 25-30 minutes. What we need is to have that sort of community there, with a center so that people can live there. When we're talking about elderly people, and encouraging them to live here, we need to encourage them to live somewhere where they have a center of convenient services.

Everybody knows right now, West Bloomfield and Farmington Hills is gone – there's very little to no open land. I've looked at the map for Commerce Township and the northwest side of the Township is about half vacant land. There will be a concentration of people who start building there. When we talk about building affordable houses, the problem is that they're very small houses. If you build small houses, that means a lot of residents living there, and they need services. Without creating services, you can't create community.

I'm saying, let's wait right now because I know the situation with COVID and what's going on. Within a few years, once this is sorted out and we know where we are going, we have to start thinking about the master plan, where we can have community with a center of services, and how to connect those communities to each other, and how to get around the main route for movement to connect to neighboring communities.

Chairperson Parel – Those were all good comments. From my perspective, I agree. I think a vision and guiding principles are important things. We can talk amongst ourselves. George took the first stab at this and I'm sure each of us has some comments to add to this.

I have no problem with this as some type of a deliverable that we use as a conversation piece with the Board. I wonder how this really differs from 2015 when the original plan was put together. A lot of these items are things I could have seen us doing 5 or 10 years ago. I think this is an important piece of it, but then we'll really need to get into the weeds and look at some of the areas; the Haggerty Road corridor, M-5 and Martin Parkway and really dive into those. It seems to me that with the Planning Director and several members of the Board, we're leaning toward making a change to this. I've never been involved in anything like this, but Dave, I'm assuming we're going to get pretty micro. It's not just stating what our principles are, but then we have to really look at this map and determine what we're going to change.

Dave Campbell – I would agree. What I'm hoping to do tonight in the time we have left, and at our meeting on January 10th, is try to come to a consensus of what those focus areas are. What are those guiding principles? And I don't know if 5 is a magic number, or if there is a magic number.

Ms. Bahm – We can have as many as we want. I think the handout was a good place to start. I think you're right, there's more opportunity to refine that. Based on the feedback that we got, I was hoping people might come tonight with a little bit more in terms of those guiding principles. The vision is always grandiose. We can go back to the slide on the 10-year vision.

Then when we get into those map changes, we start looking at that when we talk about making a change, whether a property is serving us well or not, and the designations for that, then we go back to those guiding principles. How is it designated now? How is that impacting us and how will our guiding principles lead us to keep it the same or make a change? It keeps you in the rails of the planning process. There can be a lot of things that come up in the process as well, and some may be great ideas, but we want to keep the principles in mind so we don't get off track.

I know we have a short timeline today, but if you have other input you want us to consider based on the survey results ...

Chairperson Parel – My guess is that other people on the Commission may have some comments or additions to what George started.

Weber – We may want to capture those now.

Ms. Bahm – Maybe you can send them to Dave.

Weber – I think there's value in talking about those.

Chairperson Parel – In five minutes, we can go down the line. The thought is that we'd start with the guiding principles that George laid out here. I think they're good.

Winkler – I have three things I'd like to mention. One is that George's guiding principles in the PowerPoint are fundamentally sound, but I go back to Dave Campbell's email from November 30th where he suggested some other guiding principles. One of them touched on making sure we're careful in developing some of the vacant parcels that will be coming up in front of the Planning Commission and the Township Board at some point in time, which includes the Beaumont site, Williams International, Union Lake Golf Course, and Bay Pointe.

Secondly, George's comments about engaging the Board are absolutely right. Whatever we come up with, the Board has to buy into it. We need to get this done right and in a way that everybody approves it.

And then, I turned my survey in late. I greatly appreciate you including that in the responses. I was a little worried.

Ms. Bahm – Thank you, we appreciate it.

Karim – I do like the guiding principles. I think it is good, but the devil is in the details.

Rebeck – I think the principles are great. As we go through this process, I think we need to be very careful that we focus on things that we're going to actually be able to implement, and not just things that sound really great but are never going to happen. As I looked through the 2015 master plan, there were a lot of ideas, but not everything came to fruition, for a multitude of reasons I'm sure.

McKeever – I agree whole heartedly with everything that George has laid out. Even pertaining to the open spaces that we need to consider in the future, I believe that would fall under the management of growth. With what is left in the community, these mass properties that are open, I think we really need to come up with a plan that allows us to manage the growth without taking the property from the owners.

As someone who has lived here since 1967, I've seen 50-some years' worth of road improvements and transportation concepts come through the Township, and congestion and traffic has continued to get worse. With every improvement that we've done, the traffic in the area has just continued to get worse. I don't see where there will be a magic pill or plan to cure congestion. I'm the person who said, I still see us having traffic congestion in 10 years, because I've lived with it for 50+ years. I think those are the issues that are really going to make or break Commerce Township moving forward.

Loskill – I agree with everything I've heard so far, and I agree with Chelsea. I want to implement things that we can actually accomplish. I'd like to see local development for businesses, but I'm not sure with the way retail is going right now whether that's even possible. I like the idea, but I'm not sure it's practical anymore. I think that's a product of our times.

I don't know if we should get into the master plan and have some discussions before we go to the Board, or just have quick discussion with the Board and then really dive deep into the master plan to see what areas we want to tweak, or which areas we think are good for the next 5 years. I think there's a lot of work there and a lot of discussion to be had. I'm not sure if we can do it in an hour before the monthly meetings.

Chairperson Parel – I agree, and I think when we talk about workshops, that's where the real detail gets done. We sit around a table and look at maps. I know we're running out of time and I'll wind it up.

I put down some thoughts when I read George's comments. I think we could beef up the sustainability piece. In addition, environmental impact, building materials, reduction of resources and sustainable development. I think those are really important and what's going to change over the next 10 years as it relates to those items. I think George touched on a lot of important things. I want to make sure they're strongly worded as they relate to traffic, transient housing, accessibility and transportation. I think it's important to note the beauty of the nature and the natural feel of our community, which is in here. I'll put some more thoughts together. If anybody else has additional thoughts, forward them to Dave so we can wind the guiding principles together. We have made a commitment to send the survey out to the Trustees, and we're going to start engaging the community. I think we're heading down the right path, but we've got a lot of work ahead of us.

Dave Campbell – I don't disagree. I see us meeting with the Township Board as part of the beginning. That will give us some assurance that we're going in the right direction.

Weber – We'll see as we go along, but maybe this will be a subject on each of the quarterly Township Board meetings, where there's an update and an opportunity for feedback. Basically, a checkpoint with the Board as we go through the process.

Ms. Bahm – I think that's a great suggestion. I agree and would reiterate what Dave said about that being the beginning of the process with the Township Board. It's a confirmation that you're heading in the right direction, and having those check-ins will be useful for all of you.

I think if you can send any additional feedback to Dave, we can work with him to refine that and you can talk about the guiding principles at your next meeting in January.

Chairperson Parel – Dave, is it fair to say to the Commissioners, if you have any additional comments, let's try to get them in by the end of the week?

Dave Campbell – I heard what you said, Mr. Parel, and I agree with you. The Planning Commission Chair just gave you all a directive, and I concur.

Weber – At our January 10th meeting, we want to come out of that with a draft document that's going to be included in the Board packet for the 25th.

Dave Campbell – That is what I'm working toward, yes.

Chairperson Parel – I think it's an appropriate time to adjourn. I don't want to start the next meeting late.

J: OTHER MATTERS TO COME BEFORE THE COMMISSION:

None.

K: PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

- **NEXT REGULAR MEETING DATE: MONDAY, DECEMBER 13, 2021 @ 7PM.**
- *Report to follow during the regularly scheduled meeting.*

L: ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Rebeck, supported by Loskill, to adjourn the meeting at 6:55pm.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Brian Winkler, Secretary