**CITY OF ST CLAIR**

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

**WEDNESDAY, DEC 11, 2019 – 7:00 P.M.**

**ST CLAIR CITY HALL**

**547 N. CARNEY**

**CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Terry Beier called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

**ROLL CALL:** Chairman Terry Beier Vice-Chair Dan McCartney

Council Rep Mike Laporte Member Nancy Beaudua Member Steve Grates Member Paul Wade

Member Matthew Griffor

**ABSENT:** Mike LaPorte Steve Grates

*Dan McCartney made a motion to excuse Mike LaPorte and Steve Grates.* *Supported by Nancy Beaudua. All in favor, none opposed.*

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA*:*** *Nancy Beaudua made a motion to approve the Agenda. Supported by Matt Griffor. All in favor, none opposed.*

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**: *Dan McCartney made a motion to approve the Minutes from the November 13, 2019 meeting. Supported by Nancy Beaudua. All in favor, none opposed.*

**CORRESPONDENCE:**  Planning Commission Annual Report

Redevelopment Ready Communities Certification

Terry Beier – This is something that we are supposed to do as part of the Michigan Planning Enabling Act. Jen is going to take the minutes from the past year and fill it out. We will finalize it then get it back to Administration to be filed.

**PUBLIC HEARING:** None

**NEW BUSINESS:** Master Plan Update

Geoff Donaldson, AICP, Senior Planner

St. Clair County

**OLD BUSINESS:** None

Terry Beier – Welcome Geoff Donaldson.

Geoff Donaldson – Thank you for having me this evening. As you know they process to update the City’s Master Plan began over a year ago. For several reasons we are here tonight to get close to the finish line on it.

It became clear to us that we had an opportunity to look at the report that came out of the State after all of the meetings and discussions. We want to make sure that if there are any major things that stand out through that process and doing a self-evaluation as a community that these things are included in the Master Plan.

The other opportunity that came out is the City’s pursuit of being a recipient of the Michigan State University Extension FIT assessment program. I like to call this the “Secret Shopper” for your community. They came in and did an assessment of the community and they presented the findings to us. We want to incorporate those findings as well.

As you may recall we participated in what we called a “local leader survey” online. We developed a 25-question survey and sent that out. The response was fantastic. We got quite a bit of input from that and we are using that as we work on developing the chapters of your Master Plan.

We also held a Public Visioning session and had enough people to have two break out groups. We received a lot of input at that meeting as well. We really focused on the future land use in the community. The Master Plan covers quite a bit of different areas.

The reason I am here this evening is now that we have gone through all of the inputs the Planning Commission, the true author of the Master Plan, have an opportunity to make sure we are capturing the vision for the community. And give you a chance to comment on what was envisioned in 2012 and what needs to be altered, changed, added to or eliminated as far as the vision for land use in the community.

In your packet you will find (3) three different maps. One is the 2008 Land Use Map. It’s just a snap shot of Land Use that is from Semcog. Land Use maps are not always accurate but they are pretty reflective of what is going on in your community. There are two versions of the Future Land Use maps from 2012. One is the actual map that came out of the Master Plan and it shows parcel lines. The other one is without parcel lines.

The Master Plan is quite often open to interpretation. What we have encountered is that there can be a rezoning that occurs beyond a parcel line that makes sense to say that it is contiguace to this and it makes sense to rezone. That’s why we find non-parcel based future land use maps in a Master Plan to be beneficial.

I have drafted a few questions that I wanted to go over with you.

* How do you feel about going from a parcel-based map to a more generalized map? This leaves your Master Plan up for interpretation and moves the decisions up to the Zoning Plan.
* What kind of patterns or rezoning have you seen emerge in the community? Is a trend occurring that may not have been identified in 2012?
* The old Middle School is currently identified as “public quasi-public”. The proposed use for it is “work force housing”. What is the language in Adaptive Reuse? The property is zoned R1A. Do you want to keep it as is or put it under another of the residential properties?
  + Property should stay zoned R1A
* Looking at the property where Eddy Elementary/Gearing Schools are located. Is this something you want to look at and identify future land use now? What does the community want to see there? Do you want to place this property on the future “Focus Area”?
  + Eddy should be referenced as R1, Gearing as R2
* Clinton from M-29 to 6th Street is currently commercial/commerce/office. Do you see expansion of that corridor? Should it be left as is?
  + Leave as is
* Fred Moore from Jordan Creek to City limits. Is this appropriate to be all commerce/office? Any changes in this corridor?
  + Keep as is
* Three Development Focus Areas were developed back in 2012. Are these still relevant?
  + The area off of Clinton, east of the tracks, is no longer a focus area as the apartments are being built there. Now that the apartments are there does it need to be a focus area?
* Is the focus area by the Pine River still relevant?
  + When we had this as a focus area it was because the economy was down and businesses were failing. At one time we had looked at building a multi recreational area.
* Hugo and Carney Drive area is another Development Focus Area. Is this an area we want to keep as a focus area?
  + Keep the area as is
* St. Clair Neighborhoods – In your 2012 Master Plan you list identifications per location based on character of the neighborhoods. Was this something you mapped out in 2012 or is this something older that had been mapped out years before. Do you want to keep it in the new Master Plan?
  + Leave it as is
* Brown to Clinton, bordered by 9th Street is a mixed bag in the Future Land Use. It is a combination of traditional neighborhood, downtown area and public area. With the many changes in the downtown area do you see any need to re-identify this area?
  + Leave it as is

Geoff Donaldson – That’s it, as far as the questions I had for you. Based off of my observation here and going through the survey and the comments we received at the Public Vision. We are working on other parts of the Master Plan as well but I really wanted to get your opinions on the structure of the maps.

Terry Beier – When would you be back to us with some of the changes?

Geoff Donaldson – We are looking at getting the drafts to you for consideration. I am envisioning that this would happen in the February time frame so you can start the 63-day review for the adoption of the new Master Plan.

*Dan McCartney made a motion to adjourn. Seconded by Nancy Beaudua. All in favor, none opposed.*

Meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.