CITY OF BURTON
SPECIAL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING/PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 25, 2001, 6:00 P.M., COUNCIL CHAMBERS

The Special Meeting was called to order by Jerry Grantner, Chairman, at 6:00 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bertram, Brawner, Grantner, Perez, Mayor Smiley, Walls, White and Young.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Hohloch

OTHERS PRESENT: J. Major, DPW Director; T. Strasser, Deputy Planning Official and C. Ladd, Deputy Clerk.

A. PURPOSE OF THE MEETING: Discussion and Possible Adoption of the 2001 Master Plan/Land Use Plan.

Mr. Grantner announced that no action would be taken this evening. This is a public hearing where we will get information. Mr. Grantner said he wants to draw a distinction between the master plan and a zoning map. He said we have a land use map not a zoning map. Any future zoning that change would have to be requested by the applicant. This is not a zoning change that we are talking about. This is a proposed land use. Mr. Piggott from Rowe, Inc., does have a commitment tonight and therefore, we will adjourn the meeting shortly before 8:00 P.M.
Mr. Grantner commented that after the audience participation and Mr. Piggott's presentation, he would field questions from the audience.

B. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Pauline Dargel, 6119 Hugh St., spoke concerning the elimination of Suburban Estates and R-1A, providing larger lots in some parts of the city and developmental zoning. Bentley School being shown as developmental zoning while all other schools are shown as open space is an issue that should be addressed.

September Misener, 3328 S. Vassar Rd., requested an additional public hearing before the Planning Commission votes on the master plan. She commented on the notice for this public hearing and read some of the objectives that were given at the previous meetings. Mrs. Misener stated said the residents in her area do not have five homes per acre. She asked that the master plan reflect the vision of having larger homes with larger lots in her area.

Charlotte Krawczyk, 4295 Fairwood Dr., commented that because of the size of her lot, she was able to add onto her home. She thinks the smaller lots do not allow enough room for children to have a good play area. She is in favor of having the larger lots.

Cherie Doucette, 6435 Milano, said she is for growth in the City of Burton and would like the image of Burton to be better. She said she wants the growth done responsibly and many of the developers do not live in the City.

Lynn Haynes, 3121 Eastgate St., said he moved to this area because of the open space and the decent lot sizes. He said he would like to see 100'x250' size lots, with three lots per acre. He is against small sized lots being approved.

Ralph Misener, 3328 S. Vassar Rd., said his family moved here because of the large sized lots and he opposes the smaller lots being approved. He said his neighborhood has fought off several rezoning cases because they don't want low density residential in their back yard.

Linda Burris-Croley, 6223 Crabtree Lane, spoke concerning the master plan draft and the cost to the residents. She commented that this map doesn't represent what the people desired at the public hearings. She also spoke concerning the addition of fees being charged for services that hadn't been done in the past.

Chris Breeden, 3340 S. Vassar Rd., said the growth is in the area and there are subdivisions that are not finished. We have continually been here to speak against the low density because we don't want this in our area.

Kim Farmer, 4508 S. Belsay Rd., said she just found out about the meeting and that the City is requesting smaller lot sizes. She thinks the smaller lots would be a disadvantage to the City in the future. Should the smaller lots be approved, we would not be able to provide the housing that may be desirable in the future.

Keith Cox, 4349 Chicory, asked how the land use map differs from the zoning map. He also asked that what is on the land use map, how does it become a new zoning?

Mr. Grantner replied that the zoning map reflects how the properties are currently zoned. The land use map represents more of a depiction of what we see down the road. There is a recommendation that this be reviewed every five years.

Mr. Major said the process of reviewing every parcel has not been done for about 30 years.

Mr. Cox spoke concerning the 70' lots and people continually applying to the Zoning Board of Appeals for variances because the sides yards setbacks are too narrow. A decision is then made whether to allow the variances or not. A 70' lot is not a selling point when purchasing a home. By changing these lot sizes, you are sealing the fate of the future people who are coming into Burton. You would be allowing the developer to sell more homes per acre but the people would be living much closer together. There are properties in Burton with 50' lots, but they are the old properties. He suggested that when the decision is made on the lot sizes, for the Board to think about where they live and asked them to support good development.

Larry Petrella, 1081 Howe Rd., said he lives in an area that has been changed from residential to office and is now being changed again. He spoke concerning the map that was developed by Rowe, Inc., not matching up with what was presented this evening. He asked that prior to a decision being made, the public be given an opportunity to speak on the master plan again.

C. PRESENTATION:

Doug Piggott, Consultant, Rowe, Inc., reviewed the history on how we got to this point on the master plan. He highlighted the major changes of the future land use plan based on the work sessions held earlier this year and would also clear up an error made by Rowe, Inc., on the land use plan. Mr. Piggott reviewed a meeting held in 1998 where there were approximately 80 residents present. At that meeting we held a visioning process, reviewed goals and policies, generated some alternative scenarios of future development and some of those were voted on. All of this information was given to the Planning Commission to look at in relation to the existing land use and future anticipated growth based on trends that have occurred, as well as future infrastructure and a host of other issues related to the future development. A public hearing was then held and there were concerns about some of the recommendations being made in regards to that plan.

Mr. Piggott explained that the land use plan is different from the zoning map. The land use plan is a vision of a potential future for the community. It is not cast in stone because things change over time. There are many factors that contribute to the changes. The zoning map is part of the zoning ordinance, which is law. The zoning ordinance is a legal document, adopted and amended by the City Council. The land use plan is a policy statement that is authorized under state statute to be prepared and adopted by the Planning Commission. When the Planning Commission reviews and makes a recommendation to the City Council on rezoning requests, their primary point of reference is whether the request is in compliance with the land use plan or not. There are times when a request may come in and not be in compliance with the plan. There could have been some change in condition, such as slower or faster growth in population or some other characteristic of the request that makes it appropriate, even though it isn't in compliance with the plan. We will change the plan to reflect the change in condition or mistakes made previously then add a recommended approval.

Mr. Piggott said the issues that were discussed at the work sessions fell into a couple different categories. The Planning Commission wanted to make sure the future plan reflected the changes that have already been approved. Mr. Piggott explained some of the changes that have been made in zoning, which is reflected on the land use map. The original drafted plan recommends the merging of several zoning categories to two categories, particularly in the area of commercial. He said he recommended going from four to two categories. The Planning Commission made the decision that it wouldn't be in the best interest of the residents in the area because there is a need to differentiate between different levels of commercial. The commercial areas have been divided into four different classifications, local, general, highway and planned shopping center. The final change, which Mr. Petrella spoke about, was the change regarding the open space of single family, low-density zoning. The open space consisted of primarily those large pieces of property throughout the City that were undeveloped. Some of the property is in the southeast quadrant of the City, but there were other pieces of property that just remain large lots. The rest of the property was designated single family, low-density, which was the equivalent of rezoning to R-1B. The plan indicates that property designated open space should be allowed to be rezoned to R-1A. If the property owner agrees to rezone and retain at least 20% of the developable property as open space, then the developer should be allowed to develop the rest of the property equivalent to the zoning of R-1B. In return for higher density development we would have open space that would be retained in perpetuity for the community. The Planning Commission was concerned about the blotchy way it showed some parcels as one designation and other parcels as another designation. It also showed some properties that were already developed in open space district. The change to the plan that the Planning Commission approved in regards to those two classifications, is that the open space designation now only stands for the land that is currently in some sort of institutional open space. Either it's parkland that is owned by the government, schools, golf courses or similar types of recreational open space or it's floodplain areas that would provide for long-term open space. All of the remainder of the land goes into the single-family low-density classification. However, in return, that classification was modified and there was general discussion on the Planning Commission about the modification, but they haven't had an opportunity to look at this yet. Mr. Piggott said he didn't change the three parts on the map that dealt specifically with the two classifications in the draft. Anyone who read the draft, basically was reading the text from the original draft.

Mr. Piggott then gave the Planning Commission members the proposed language that would address the open space residential and low density residential. He explained the criteria for each of the zoning classifications. Also included in the land use plan is the Implementation Plan for zoning and the zoning ordinance table updates.
(NOTE: A copy of the Land Use Plan-Public Hearing Draft may be obtained in the Clerk's Office)

Mr. Piggott then entertained a question and answer period with the audience.

D. BOARD DISCUSSION:

Mr. Grantner asked Mr. Major for a synopsis of the information received this evening to be included in their packets for the next meeting. He said this would be an item discussed at the next regular meeting. Mr. Grantner asked if the minutes would be completed by the next regular meeting date.

Mrs. Ladd replied every attempt would be made to get them done, but ballots should be coming in and would have to be sent out.

BOARD ACTION: None.

The next regularly scheduled meeting will be held on Tuesday, October 9, 2001, at 6:00 P.M.

Meeting Adjourned at 7:54 P.M.

Cheryl M. Ladd, CMC, Deputy City Clerk