

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MERIDIAN  
TOWNSHIP BOARD REGULAR MEETING – **APPROVED** -  
5151 Marsh Road, Okemos, MI 48864-1198  
349-1200, Town Hall Room  
TUESDAY, MARCH 2, 2004, **6:00 P.M.**

PRESENT: Supervisor McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting, Trustees Brixie, Stier, Such  
ABSENT: Trustee Woiwode  
STAFF: Township Manager Gerald Richards, Director of Community Planning & Development Mark Kieselbach, Director of Engineering & Public Works Ray Severy, Police Chief Gary Gibbons, EMS/Fire Chief Fred Cowper, Personnel Director/Assistant Manager Paul Brake, Attorney Andria Ditschman

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Supervisor McGillicuddy called the meeting to order at 6:02 P.M.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Supervisor McGillicuddy led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. ROLL CALL

Supervisor McGillicuddy called the roll of the Board.

4. PUBLIC REMARKS

Supervisor McGillicuddy opened and closed Public Remarks.

5. REPORTS/BOARD COMMENT/NEW WORRIES

Clerk Helmbrecht reminded residents of the Special Election on Monday, March 15<sup>th</sup> for the Ingham Intermediate School District.

Trustee Brixie announced the Meridian Area Business Association's (MABA) 6<sup>th</sup> Annual MABA Expo at Haslett High School on Saturday, March 13<sup>th</sup> from 10:00 A.M. until 3:00 P.M. The purpose of the Expo is to introduce residents to a free sampling of what the Meridian Township area has to offer.

Trustee Stier summarized the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting of February 25, 2004.

Treasurer Hunting noted that as of today, real property taxes were turned over to the County for collection.

Supervisor McGillicuddy announced the retirement of Bill Riske from the Meridian Volunteer Council and added that he has been a faithful member since the Council's inception.

Supervisor McGillicuddy also thanked staff for the time put into the compilation of the 2003 Annual Report.

6. APPROVAL OF AGENDA — OR CHANGES

**Trustee Brixie moved to approve the agenda as submitted. Seconded by Trustee Such.**

VOICE VOTE: Motion carried 6-0.

7. CONSENT AGENDA

Supervisor McGillicuddy reviewed the consent agenda.

**Trustee Such moved to adopt the Consent Agenda. Seconded by Trustee Brixie.**

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Stier, Such, Supervisor McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MERIDIAN, REGULAR MEETING, MARCH 2, 2004 \*Approved\*

NAYS: None  
Motion carried 6-0.

The adopted Consent Agenda items are as follow:

A. Communications

(1). Board Deliberation (BD)

9A Gregory L. Shaw, 2200 Quarry Road, East Lansing; RE: Opposition to 2004 Order to Maintain Sidewalk Special Assessment District #6

(2). Board Information (BI)

- BI-1 Eleanor V. Luecke, President, LINC, PO Box 40, Okemos; RE: Concern surrounding approval of SUP #04-88131 (Bharatiya)
- BI-2 Charles Louis Willems, PO Box 184, Haslett; RE: Assessing Department's description of his property as lakefront
- BI-3 Hamilton House Condominiums, 2044 Hamilton Road, Okemos; RE: Co-owner petition in opposition to SUP #03021 (Fineout)
- BI-4 Bruce M. Look, 4298 Maitland Road, Williamsburg; RE: Request to rezone property at 1792 Hamilton Road from RC to PO and C-2
- BI-5 Eleanor V. Luecke, President, LINC, PO Box 40, Okemos; RE: Copy of letter to the Planning Commission Chair on the Status of LINC Suggestions for the Future Land Use Map

(3) Regional Linkage (RL)

RL-1 John W. Midgley, P.E., Managing Director, Ingham County Road Commission, 301 Bush Street, Mason; RE: ICRC 2004 Local Road Improvement Program Recommendation

(4). Staff Communication/Referral (SC)

- SC-1 Michigan Townships Association Legislative Fax February 13, 2004 Edition
- SC-2 Michigan Townships Association Legislative Fax February 20, 2004 Edition

**Trustee Such moved that the communications be received and placed on file, and any communications not already assigned for disposition be referred to the Township Manager or Supervisor for follow-up. Seconded by Trustee Brixie.**

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Stier, Such, Supervisor McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting  
NAYS: None  
Motion carried 6-0.

B. Minutes

**Trustee Such moved to approve and ratify the minutes of the February 17, 2004 Regular Meeting as submitted. Seconded by Trustee Brixie.**

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Stier, Such, Supervisor McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting  
NAYS: None  
Motion carried 6-0.

C. Bills

**Trustee Such moved that the Township Board approve the Manager's Bills as follows:**

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MERIDIAN, REGULAR MEETING, MARCH 2, 2004 \*Approved\*

Common Cash	\$ 224,874.12
Public Works	\$ 219,068.60
Total Checks	\$ 443,942.72
Credit Card Transactions	\$ 9,483.59
Total Purchases	<u>\$ 453,426.31</u>
ACH Payments	<u>\$ 1,495,843.61</u>

**Seconded by Trustee Brixie.**

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Stier, Such, Supervisor McGillicuddy, Clerk  
Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting  
NAYS: None  
Motion carried 6-0.

[Bill list in Official Minute Book]

D. Support for Meridian EDC Small Town Design Initiative Project

**Trustee Such moved that the Township Board strongly endorse the Small Town Design Initiative Project submitted by the Meridian EDC and that the Township Supervisor is authorized to send a letter of support for the application. Seconded by Trustee Brixie.**

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Stier, Such, Supervisor McGillicuddy, Clerk  
Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting  
NAYS: None  
Motion carried 6-0.

E. Renew Employee Computer Purchase Plan

**Trustee Such moved to reopen the Employee Computer Purchase Program until December 31, 2005. Seconded by Trustee Brixie.**

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Stier, Such, Supervisor McGillicuddy, Clerk  
Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting  
NAYS: None  
Motion carried 6-0.

F. 2004 Order to Construct Sidewalks Special Assessment District #2, **Resolution #3**

**Trustee Such moved to approve 2004 Order to Construct Sidewalks Special Assessment District #2, Resolution #3, approving the public improvement to construct the sidewalks for Lot 90, Woodside Estates #6, and Lot 13, Carriage Hill Estates; defray the cost by special assessment; approving the estimate of cost of \$1,987.20; determining the special assessment district; and authorizing notices be sent to the property owners giving 60 days notice to construct the sidewalk.**

**Seconded by Trustee Brixie.**

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Stier, Such, Supervisor McGillicuddy, Clerk  
Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting  
NAYS: None  
Motion carried 6-0.

[Signed and Sealed Resolution in Official Minute Book]

8. QUESTIONS FOR THE ATTORNEY (See Agenda Item #11A)

9. HEARINGS

A. 2004 Order to Maintain Sidewalk Special Assessment District #6  
Supervisor McGillicuddy opened the public hearing at 6:05 P.M.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MERIDIAN, REGULAR MEETING, MARCH 2, 2004 \*Approved\*

Director Severy summarized the 2004 sidewalk replacement program as outlined in staff memorandum dated February 27, 2004.

Supervisor McGillicuddy asked if there was a way for the Township to have an agreement with the contractors who drive their trucks on the sidewalks.

Director Severy responded that if our inspectors see Consumers Energy driving on the sidewalks and those sidewalks are cracked, a bill is sent to Consumers for repair of those sidewalks and pathways. There are sidewalks, however, that are damaged by a utility company or a contractor that the Township does not know about.

Supervisor McGillicuddy inquired if the utility companies and contractors are under any obligation to inform the Township that they are to be in a certain area performing work.

Director Severy answered that the Township requests the utility companies obtain a permit if they are to do work near a sidewalk. It is a no-cost permit which allows the Township to be aware of and monitor the work.

Supervisor McGillicuddy inquired if the residents have the option of having the sidewalk repaired themselves.

Director Severy stated the residents have twenty (20) days to do the work themselves or contact the Township to request an extension if they are going to do the work themselves.

Treasurer Hunting stated, in fairness, the Township should take an individual look at Mr. Shaw's situation and make an equitable judgment which would reflect the extenuating circumstances regarding his property.

Director Severy responded that he would take a closer look to determine what happened on his property by looking at which utility companies are in the box they repeatedly connected to by driving heavy equipment over Mr. Shaw's property.

Trustee Brixie asked if the Township accommodates a homeowner who would like a sidewalk from the pathway to their front door redone at the same time the sidewalk is being repaired.

Director Severy responded that the Township does not get involved in this process and that the homeowner would need to contact the contractor directly.

Trustee Brixie further inquired if the name of the contractor is known prior to commencement of the work so that the homeowner could contact the contractor directly.

Director Severy stated the name of the contractor is known well in advance of the work; specifically, when the contract is awarded.

Trustee Stier asked if there is a life expectancy on sidewalks.

Director Severy answered that if the concrete base was done correctly, the sidewalk could last between thirty (30) to fifty (50) years. Some of the sidewalks which were replaced last year were poured in the late 1920's.

Trustee Stier stated it was his understanding that the first stage of sidewalk construction for Keystone subdivision began in 1987 and asked Director Severy if he could provide a rough percentage of scheduled sidewalk replacement in that neighborhood.

Director Severy stated he would need to look into that.

Trustee Stier then inquired if it would be ten percent (10%) or ninety percent (90%).

Manager Richards offered that the Keystone subdivision is adjacent to his neighborhood and that a

ten percent (10%) replacement estimate would be high.

Trustee Stier felt people who purchase homes in the township should not need to replace their sidewalk within seventeen years or less. The situation needs to be looked into to determine if the standards for sidewalks need to be raised.

PUBLIC

Don Rockford, 1822 Sun Hollow Court, Okemos, expressed the following concerns/questions:

- His purchase of the property in Crestwood Subdivision at 1822 Sun Hollow Court in October, 2003
- Pool of water on sidewalk in front of his house
- Spoke with both the Township and the Ingham County Drain Commissioner
- Who determines the repairs
- How the price is assessed for replacement costs

Director Severy responded there is an assessment of \$129 on this property, and he will look at the sidewalk to see if the portion where it is pooling is scheduled to be replaced. He will also look to see if the settlement was caused by a utility cut underneath or if the sidewalk was improperly poured. Differential settlement is not normally a concern of the Drain Commissioner; typically, it is under the purview of the Township.

Director Severy stated replacement cost is determined based on cost estimates on prior work. The cost will be adjusted based on the "as bid" price when the contract is awarded.

Mr. Rockford inquired if there is money allotted in the Township budget for ongoing sidewalk repairs.

Director Severy responded that the cost of sidewalk repair is the responsibility of the property owner. The Township pays for sidewalk repairs that are at the intersection and fall outside of the extended property lines and also for handicap ramps down into the street. If the property owner is on a corner lot, the Township also pays a portion of sideyard sidewalk replacement.

Trustee Such asked Director Severy to outline the process for determining sidewalk repair.

Director Severy responded that criteria exist for determining sidewalk repair. If the sidewalk is cracked and the cracks are one-quarter inch ( $\frac{1}{4}$ " ) or bigger, they are replaced. If a sidewalk has differential settlement of three-quarters of an inch ( $\frac{3}{4}$ " ) or more, it is determined to be a tripping hazard and replaced. (NOTE: Guideline is actually 1inch)

Supervisor McGillicuddy closed the public hearing at 6:20 P.M.

10. ACTION ITEMS/ENDS

Supervisor McGillicuddy opened public comment.

Joan Guy, 1083 Woodside Drive, Haslett, spoke concerning the sewer capacity allocation for the area in and near the Request to Amend Eyde Company Stipulated Agreement.

Bob Homan, 2176 Hamilton Road, Okemos, availed himself for questions concerning Planned Unit Development #03014 (Wells).

Supervisor McGillicuddy closed public comment.

A. Request to Amend Eyde Company Stipulated Agreement

**Trustee Brixie moved [and read into the record] NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that this matter is referred to the Township Planning Commission for its recommendation as to whether those court orders governing the zoning, permitted uses and development of the parcel that is the subject of this Resolution should be amended to replace the current professional and office (PO) zoning assigned that parcel to multiple family residential (RD)**

**not to exceed eight dwelling units per acre.**

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the recommendation of the Planning Commission shall address whether a multiple family residential (RD) zoning classification: (a) would be more consistent with the Township's Comprehensive Development Plan than the professional and office (PO) zoning classification currently assigned the subject parcel; (b) would be compatible with other existing and proposed uses surrounding the subject parcel; (c) would not result in significant adverse impacts on the natural environment; (d) would not result in significant adverse impacts on traffic circulation, water and sewer systems, education, recreation and other public services; (e) would address a proven community need; (f) would result in the logical and orderly development of the Township, and; (g) would result in better use of land, resources and properties so as to promote the more efficient expenditure of Township funds for public improvements and services.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the recommendation requested by this Resolution shall be completed and submitted for consideration by the Township Board at its regular meeting scheduled for April 6, 2004. To facilitate this schedule and avoid unnecessary duplication, the Planning Commission shall not conduct a public hearing in connection with this matter, but a public hearing will be conducted by the Township Board prior to taking action on the request to amend the court orders governing the zoning, permitted use and development of the subject parcel.

**Seconded by Trustee Such.**

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Stier, Such, Supervisor McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting  
NAYS: None  
Motion carried 6-0.

[Signed and Sealed Resolution in Official Minute Book]

- B. Rezoning #04010 (Fedewa), request to rezone approximately .93 acres of land at 5842 Okemos Road from RR (Rural Residential) to RC (Multiple Family-Medium Density)  
**Treasurer Hunting moved [and read into the record] NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF THE CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MERIDIAN hereby INTRODUCES FOR PUBLICATION AND SUBSEQUENT ADOPTION Ordinance No. \_\_\_\_\_, entitled "Ordinance Amending the Zoning District Map of Meridian Township Pursuant to Rezoning Petition #04010" RR (Rural Residential) to RC (Multiple Family-Medium Density). Seconded by Trustee Brixie.**

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Stier, Such, Supervisor McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting  
NAYS: None  
Motion carried 6-0.

[Signed and Sealed Resolution in Official Minute Book]

- C. Planned Unit Development #03014 (Wells), final review of the proposed 24-site Cider Mill Place condominium development  
**Trustee Such moved [and read into the record], NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF THE CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MERIDIAN hereby grants final planned unit development approval for Planned Unit Development #03014, subject to the following conditions:**

1. **Final approval is granted in accordance with the revised plans prepared by Fitzgerald Henne & Associates, Inc., dated February 12, 2004, depicting twenty-four (24) single-family condominium sites in the Cider Mill Place PUD and subject to revisions as required.**
2. **Final utility, street, and pathway plans for the site shall be subject to the approval of the Director of Engineering and Public Works, and shall be in accordance with the Township Engineering Design and Construction Standards.**
3. **The condominium master deed and bylaws shall provide for the care and maintenance of the utilities and the private road and the documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Director of Engineering and Public Works prior to submittal to the State of Michigan.**
4. **The boundary lines of the land being donated to the Township's Parks and Recreation Department shall be identified on all final construction plans.**
5. **The proposed road shall be identified as a private road and shall be designed and constructed pursuant to Ingham County Road Commission standards.**
6. **The required building setback from the center of the right-of-way of Okemos Road for Site #1 and Site #24 shall be seventy-five (75) feet.**
7. **Final approval is subject to the applicant receiving all required permits, licenses, and approvals, from the Ingham County Drain Commissioner's office, Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, and the Township. A copy of each shall be forwarded to the Township.**
8. **If a permit is necessary from the Michigan Department of Environmental huality (MDEQ), no grading or construction shall take place until the State permit is final and un-appealable at the MDEQ.**
9. **Prior to any grading or construction on the subject site, the Township and Ingham County Drain Commissioner's office shall review and approve the location and installation of silt fencing and other required protective measures separating the proposed work and on-site wetlands, and water features setbacks.**
10. **Required silt fencing, sidewalks, pathways, decks, street trees, adjacent driveways, and building corner elevations shall be shown on all plot plans.**
11. **No dwelling units or associated structural appurtenances shall be permitted in the regulated wetlands or the required water features setback.**
12. **Any remaining water supply or monitoring wells on the subject site shall be properly closed and abandoned per the requirements and approval of the Ingham County Health Department. In no case shall new wells be constructed for the purposes of irrigation or water supply.**
13. **The species and location of the street trees shall be subject to the approval of the Director of Community Planning and Development.**
14. **Street lights shall be designed to minimize glare and light trespass. Final review and approval of the streetlights shall subject to the review and approval of the Director of**

**Community Planning and Development.**

- 15. All other applicable conditions of the preliminary and secondary planned unit development approvals shall remain in effect.**

**Seconded by Treasurer Hunting.**

Board members discussed the following:

- Ease in reading maps provided by applicant
- Side slopes of four (4) foot horizontal to one (1) foot vertical for stormwater detention area
- Applicant met with the Park Commission and walked the site
- Woodchip pathway location in a common area
- Maintenance of woodchip pathway responsibility of the homeowners through enforcement of the master deed by the homeowners association

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Stier, Such, Supervisor McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting

NAYS: None

Motion carried 6-0.

[Signed and Sealed Resolution in Official Minute Book]

**D. Resolution for U.S.G.S. Aquifer Study Financing**

Director Severy summarized the aquifer study, which is an update to an existing study done between 1988 and 1992. The purpose is to examine the Saginaw Aquifer, the source of the Township's and surrounding communities' public drinking water. The intent is to determine the impact existing and new wells will have on the aquifer and address concerns regarding contamination of the aquifer.

Board members discussed the following:

- Use of a GIS modeling system through U.S.G.S.
- Avoid "cone of depression" by ability to modulate each well to create an even amount of water
- Board of Water and Light participation
- Larger participating units of government have already approved the expenditure
- Use of 2000 population census for determination of each community's financial participation
- Entire cost for the Township's portion from this year's budget

**Trustee Brixie moved [and read into the record] NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT:**

- 1. The Charter Township of Meridian agrees to participate in the Tri-County Area Groundwater Aquifer Study and Model Update, and designates the Director of Public Works & Engineering as its official representative to serve on the aquifer study task force to advise and review the U.S. Geological Survey study results and recommendations; and,**
- 2. The Charter Township of Meridian agrees to financially support the cost of the regional groundwater aquifer study and model update in the amount of 12.79% of the local cost share needed to match the U.S. Geological Survey's grant and based on a fair share population formula utilized by the Groundwater Management Board of the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission; and,**
- 3. The Charter Township of Meridian shall expend funds in the amount of \$25,612.00 from the 2004 Water System Budget as full payment to the Tri-County Regional Planning**

**Commission for the Charter Township of Meridian's share of the costs for the Tri-County Area Groundwater Aquifer Study and Model Update; and,**

4. **The 2004 Water System Budget shall be amended to include this expenditure.**

**Seconded by Clerk Helmbrecht.**

ROLL CALL VOTE: YEAS: Trustees Brixie, Stier, Such, Supervisor McGillicuddy, Clerk Helmbrecht, Treasurer Hunting  
NAYS: None  
Motion carried 6-0.

[Signed and Sealed Resolution in Official Minute Book]

11. DISCUSSION ITEMS/ENDS

Supervisor McGillicuddy opened and closed public comment.

A. Ordinance Amendment to Signs

Director Kieselbach stated the Township Attorney has reviewed an earlier edition and made comments which are reflected in the current document. The Township Attorney has looked at the draft sign ordinance again and there are issues which require Township Board decisions. There is background on case law where communities have had problems with enforcement and/or interpretation of its sign ordinance. These are the topics which need to be discussed.

Previous Board concerns: (Questions for the Attorney (See Agenda Item #8))

Q. Did you get a copy of all of the Board concerns?

A. I have a copy of the minutes from the last meeting. A lot of the concerns that the Board noted were addressed in a previous version that we had sent back to the Township. Some of those changes were put in; some were not. Mark and I have set up a meeting to go over that together by line item, to go through each change to make sure the changes that I have already suggested are in there. Evidently, some of those were missed in an earlier version. One of the areas he and I have talked about at length is political signs. We can just generalize and say temporary sign. The way the ordinance was written previously was specific as to...I think it reads something like this, "You may have a political sign for each candidate" or something to that extent. Recently there was a letter that was sent out, I believe it was going to be sent out, to anyone that would put up political signs, saying that this is the rule of the Township.

My recommendation is that we review that section more closely. There are several options. We could say that you may have a certain number of temporary signs and you may use them however you choose to do that, whether it is supporting a candidate or a for sale sign. There is a number so that we don't have to be specific. Maybe we say two (2) or maybe one (1), so that if they are putting up a for sale sign, they can't put up their "vote for so and so" at the same time. There are some issues we can look at. Our recommendation is that we not use the language as it is currently written based on case law.

Procedural timeline: (Questions for the Attorney (See Agenda Item #8))

Q. Procedurally, would it be best for you and Mark to sit down and go through that and let me know when you are ready to bring it back after it is reviewed?

A. I think so, except there are a couple of areas that he might need further input from the Board as to where you want to go. One is that political issue because what is difficult about the sign ordinance is, from a legal standpoint, you want to be as content neutral as possible. The difficulty with that is it may mean less regulation. From the Board's point of view, you want to know where there are problems out there in the community and try to regulate those so that it doesn't cause problems with traffic, too many signs in one place, etc. At the same time, we don't want to overstep the bounds and the legal lines that are out there. The political sign is one issue. Another issue we may need to consider may be the mall. Mark and I just spoke yesterday about looking at some other ordinances to see if we separate the mall issue out entirely to have its own section or do we treat it as

commercial. It might be that the mall is different enough that we can treat it in its own section. It may be something you want to at least give input so that he knows where to go with that and how much research to do.

I understand the lighting issue. It sounds, from the last meeting, that you want that addressed. I think, Mr. Woodworth, who was here at the last meeting, suggested you put some of those provisions right in the sign ordinance and that is being done.

The other suggestion I want to make is that the Board....I don't believe I saw this in the minutes and it may be that it was just not written real specifically in there, but if there are areas that you see problems with in the community, then we should address those in the sign ordinance. Sometimes, what communities do is have a consultant or specialist come in and look at your community and say this is where you are having problems. Now, you may feel that you had a lot of pretty good regulations and you don't have big problems, but if there are areas....I have gone through all of the requests for opinions from the Board or from Mr. Kieselbach and tried to address those issues as well as issues which seem to be popular right now. You may have an area that you say, "You know what, this seems to be a problem. Every time I go into a certain area, I see far too many signs." Those are issues we need to hear about so that we can address those in the sign ordinance because we certainly don't drive everywhere in the Township. Everybody has a different view.

I think those are the main areas that I had marked that we haven't already addressed in the ordinance. And, yes, we need one more time to sit down so I can make sure that not only does he have my recommendations, but that he understands why I made them so that we are clear that some of them, for legal purposes, really need to be in there. So we are going to do that.

Number and types of sign variances: (Questions for the Attorney (See Agenda Item #8))

Q. I don't know if you have already considered this, but could you review over the past several years the number and types of requests for variances? We have seen lots of requests for one (1) or two (2) different sign variances and put that in the mix of things to reference.

A. O.K.

Board members discussed the following:

- Many variance requests for mall signage
- Litigation coming out of the mall signage
- Preference to modify the ordinance to avoid further litigation by allowing larger mall signs
- Exclude outlots of the mall from allowance of larger mall signs
- Existence of legal non-conforming pre-ordinance signs
- Mall signage in separate section within the sign ordinance
- Equitable treatment with respect to signage requirement as a legal issue
- Legal research on definition of "mall"
- Not define "mall" but keep in C-3 zoning district and tie to a sign area-to-wall area proportion
- Leave in and enhance restriction for temporary signs with respect to rights-of-way
- Leave the mall signage as is if there are legal ramifications from specifying Meridian Mall
- Attorney's opinion of the pros and cons of leaving in or separating out mall signage; what other like-sized communities are doing
- Concern for limitation of political signs to two (2) per property of two (2) candidates
- No limit on number of political signs
- Limitation of political signs as a free speech issue
- Better enforcement of political sign removal after an election
- Incorporation of lighting code within sign ordinance

**It was the consensus of the Board to have the Township Attorney keep in contact with the Board if there are specific questions and apprise the Supervisor when the ordinance amendment to signs is ready to be placed on the Board agenda.**

[Supervisor McGillicuddy recessed the meeting at 7:01 P.M.]

[Supervisor McGillicuddy reconvened the meeting at 7: 11 P.M.]

12. VISION SESSION/ENDS: Lake Lansing discussion with Planning Commission members Carole Wilcox, Patricia Jackson, Eldon Clark and Thomas Deits

Supervisor McGillicuddy gave Planning Commission members examples of issues discussed to date with the various interested groups regarding potential suggestions for the Lake Lansing area redevelopment. The Supervisor asked what was important to the Planning Commission as the Board looked at Lake Lansing redevelopment issues.

Commissioner Wilcox offered the following comments and/or concerns:

- Protection of water quality of Lake Lansing as the number one priority
- Lake Lansing is a 453 acre lake fed totally by surface water runoff
- First subdivision platted in 1882
- 14 subdivisions built before 1948
- 1,024 lots in the subdivisions built long ago
- 500,000 visits per year in Lake Lansing Park North and South
- The two (2) ways of protecting water quality are to reduce the amount of [contaminated] surface water runoff by decreasing the amount of impervious surface and the prevention of overuse of the lake
- Development of performance standards for surface water runoff
- Regulation of “keyhole” or “funnel” development to prevent overuse of the lake
- More practicality of redevelopment by adjusting setbacks for side, front and rear yards
- Possible combination of side yard setbacks with use of fire retardant building materials and sprinkler systems
- Front porch improvements currently require ZBA approval for a variance
- Inconsistency in the traverse line used to determine the distance from the lake to the building to ascertain rear yard setbacks and a high watermark as a more measurable method
- A bill introduced in the legislature to let local units of government control fertilizers
- Ingham County provides for the purchase of phosphorous-free fertilizer for lake residents

Commissioner Deits offered the following comments and/or concerns:

- Natural course of the lake is to get shallower over time
- Life cycle of Lake Lansing as a geological entity which must be maintained
- Lack of public non-recreational access
- Add public amenity, e.g., restaurant on the water or café as a mixed use concept

Board members discussed the following:

- Dane County, Wisconsin banned the use of phosphorous fertilizer to protect the water quality of Lake Mendota
- Various yard configurations around the lake

Supervisor McGillicuddy announced the Board would meet with the Ingham County Road Commission at its March 16<sup>th</sup> meeting and Ingham County Park representatives on April 20<sup>th</sup>.

13. PUBLIC REMARKS

Supervisor McGillicuddy opened and closed Public Remarks.

14. ADJOURNMENT

Supervisor McGillicuddy adjourned the meeting at 7:30 P.M.

---

SUSAN MCGILLICUDDY  
TOWNSHIP SUPERVISOR

---

MARY M. G. HELMBRECHT  
TOWNSHIP CLERK

Sandra K. Otto, Secretary