

Milton Township  
Planning Commission  
Unapproved Meeting Minutes  
January 3, 2024

Members present: Chairman Hefferan, Renis, Warner, Standerfer, Ford, and Merillat.  
Members absent: Noel Peters, excused.  
Also present: Kopriva.

Hefferan called the meeting to order at 7:00pm.

Public Comment:  
None.

Approval of Agenda:

**Motion** by Ford to approve the agenda. Seconded by Renis. **Motion carried.**

Approval of Minutes dated November 1, 2024:

**Motion** by Renis to approve the minutes dated November 1, 2024 as presented. Seconded by Ford. **Motion carried.**

Approval of minutes dated December 6, 2024:

**Motion** by Ford to approve the minutes dated December 6, 2024 as presented. Seconded by Warner. **Motion carried.**

Correspondence:

There is a letter received from the TLPA board of directors dated December 31, 2023 regarding feedback on the master plan.

Old Business:

None.

New Business:

Master Plan Review. Kopriva suggested an open house or community engagement and sending it to the township board for the 63-day review. Being that it is in the winter/spring time, there should be a virtual option for the snowbirds. Kopriva is looking at getting more input on the future land use map. She laid out the steps and process for this community engagement. At this point, what are the final comments from the commission? There is the option to make changes during the 63 days and during the public comment. This is not the final review.

Renis said he would like to look over the current chapter 8 and compare it to the new chapter 9 and see how to merge it together. He would like to do this before we take it public. Renis is also concerned about the format and how it applies to our goals. The current chapter 8 and new chapter 9 are written in two different styles. If we are trying to put them together, there will need to be some adjustments. We currently have 11 areas and the new one has 5. First page is Master Plan Goals. It talks about the Ag lands and the features. Do we want to add a statement about #4. Kopriva said your plan informs your zoning ordinance. This is page 8-2, general goals #4.

Members are fine with not having that in the new plan.

Comments about the format. The old plan has bullets. This one has action statements. Should we keep this? Kopriva said her goal is to create an actionable list. Renis said when we put responsible parties and time frames, it is saying that it is not broken but we are going to fix it. Merillat suggests not putting a time frame and add “ongoing” to some items. Renis said everything in the draft of Ag is where it needs to be, on page 65 it incorporates the current farm practices. Should we keep the format? Renis suggested removing the time frame. Kopriva said a best practice is to have a time frame so you know if you are reaching your goals. MEDC requires time frames, but the enabling act does not require them.

On page 66 of the new draft should cover woodlands. Renis has some suggested language that he read from bullet 9 from page 8-9 of the current Master Plan. He would like this included. Renis suggested edits to the fourth Additional Objective on page 66. TLPA has suggested edits to the fifth additional objective on this page also. Hefferan asked if we should call out these organization by name or not? What about the others that are not named.

Standerfer asked regarding including the other lakes in the fourth bullet. Should all lakes/bodies of water be included. Kopriva said she will soften this language to broad organizations dealing in lake protection and water quality and include all lakes in our township.

Hefferan asked about the status of the sewer project. Hefferan said previous sewer language is not in the new draft. Hefferan said if they are not referenced to encourage them, then I would say you cannot do them. Merillat said the point is to plan for the future. Kopriva said the point of sewer is to protect water quality.

Current: 8-8, #7, should this be included? Hefferan asked if this would be on the Parks and Rec plan.

Current: 8-5 and 8-6. New: Housing on page 67. Looking at #2 on 8-6. Discussed with no changes.

Current: Transportation 8-7, New: Transportation page 68: Discussed with no changes.

Current: Commercial Development 8-10. New: Economic Development, page 69. The new draft does not talk about commercial development. Merillat pointed out the first statement on page 69 which does talk about commercial development, rather than just agribusiness. The goal includes supporting local business in the commercial areas of the township. Hefferan sees many of these as critical but the language can be massaged. #1, modified, #4, #7 modified, and #12 will be added to page 69.

Kopriva said she will make the changes and then get it to the planning commission She will work to get an open house time and get it on the website. Public input is planned to be March/April. Postcards should go out in February. The planning commission will then come back and review comments and go to the 63-day review in May. The public hearing would end up in September/October.

Workforce Housing Subcommittee Update:

The subcommittee met on December 13<sup>th</sup> with Tad Dowker from North Shore Docks. Dowker went over what he told us at the last meeting. He has got about 70-80 employees. His need is housing for these people. He is advocating for some type of small community and this might fall under a cluster development of tiny homes. It would have a common area with a laundry area. The unit itself would have a kitchen, bathroom and a living area. We are trying to look at the concept and how do you execute that. Is there a parcel close to the village that could include this and solve the density problem. If you go to AG you do not have density. Also, how would we handle sewer or septic. We talked about going down to a 600 sq ft house size and doing that with a shed style roof and could be an easy add on construction system. This could give space between neighbors and make it more attractive and go to a density of a quarter acre. Dowker will come back with layout plans at the next meeting. This meeting is not scheduled. Merillat asked what are the barriers? The small size of the house and the density are barriers. If you let one person do it, then everyone can do it. Should we look at what happens if we get ten of these up and down the road. Kopriva asked if there is interest in continuing to explore this as a discussion. Should we consider more dense, smaller housing in the AG district? This is the time to talk about it because we would need to update our future land use map. Ford said if we are going to support our businesses, then we have to explore this. Hefferan said yes we should consider this and he asked Kopriva to attend the next meeting.

Reports:

ZA Report:

There is a report included in the packet.

Board Report:

Renis said nothing to report.

ZBA Report:

Hefferan said they have not met.

Future Meeting Considerations:

February 7, 2024:

Workforce Housing Subcommittee.

Elections.

Bylaw review.

Meeting adjourned by order of the chair at 8:48pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph Merillat