

CITY OF MASON

201 West Ash St.
Mason, MI 48854-0370

City Hall (517) 676-9155
Fax (517) 676-1330

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING - COUNCIL CHAMBER Tuesday, November 11, 2014

6:30 p.m.

Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of Minutes: October 14, 2014
4. People from the Floor
5. Announcements
6. Regular Business
 - A. Report – Current Status of Michigan Medical Marihuana Case Law and Pending Legislation
 - B. Report – Master Plan Implementation – Sub-Area Plan Steering Committee Notes
7. Unfinished Business
8. New Business
9. Correspondence
10. Liaison Reports
11. Director Report
12. Administrator Report
13. Adjournment

**CITY OF MASON
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
MINUTES OF OCTOBER 14, 2014**

Chairperson Reeser called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers at 201 West Ash Street, Mason, Michigan.

Present: Commissioners: Fischer, Hude, Naeyaert, Reeser, Sabbadin, Scott, Trotter, Waxman
Absent: Commissioner: Barna (excused)
Also present: David Haywood, Zoning & Development Director
Deborah J. Cwierniewicz, City Clerk

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
Regular Minutes of September 9, 2014

The regular meeting Minutes of September 9, 2014, were approved as submitted.

PEOPLE FROM THE FLOOR

None.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Commissioner Trotter announced that she submitted her resignation, effective December 9, 2014
- Commissioner Tim Scott was welcomed to his first meeting as a member of the Planning Commission

REGULAR BUSINESS

Resolution No. 2014-06 – A Resolution Approving a Preliminary and Final Site Plan to Allow a Building Addition to the Existing Structure Located at 640 West Ash Street

MOTION by Naeyaert, second by Waxman,
to consider Resolution No. 2014-06 read.

MOTION APPROVED

Resolution No. 2014-06 was introduced by Waxman and seconded by Fischer.

A brief discussion was held. Dr. Zielinski, applicant, spoke briefly regarding tap in fees.

**CITY OF MASON
PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 2014-06
A RESOLUTION APPROVING A PRELIMINARY AND FINAL SITE PLAN TO ALLOW A
BUILDING ADDITION TO THE EXISTING STRUCTURE LOCATED AT 640 WEST ASH STREET**

WHEREAS, a request has been received from Timothy Zielinski for preliminary site plan approval for a 699 square foot addition to the existing building at 640 West Ash Street, said property having parcel number 33-19-10-08-129-020, and

WHEREAS, the subject property is further described as: The southerly 106.33 feet in width of lot 3, Foxcroft Farms, a subdivision on part of the NE ¼ of Section 8, T2N, R1W, City of Mason, Ingham County, Michigan, Recorded in Liber 35 of Plats pgs. 5,6,7 Ingham Co. records, State of Michigan, and

WHEREAS, City Council Resolution 2002-56 requires that each additional exam room be charged a residential equivalency unit of 0.5 of the base sanitary sewer connection fee of \$2,300, and

WHEREAS, pursuant to City Council Resolution 2002-56, the applicant shall pay additional sewer connection charge for three additional exam rooms in the amount of \$3,450 prior to occupancy, and

WHEREAS, upon compliance with the conditions of approval, the plans will comply with the site plan review standards listed in Sections 94-226 and 94-227 of Chapter 94, Zoning, of the Mason Code, and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 94-225(a), the Planning Commission hereby grants final site plan approval, and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the City of Mason Planning Commission does hereby approve a preliminary and final site plan for 699 square foot building located at 640 West Ash Street based on the plans dated September 8, 2014.

RESOLUTION APPROVED

Resolution No. 2014-05 – A Resolution Approving the Capital Improvements Plan for the Fiscal Years 2014-2019

MOTION by Naeyaert, second by Waxman,
to consider Resolution No. 2014-05 read.

MOTION APPROVED

Resolution No. 2014-05 was introduced by Waxman and seconded by Naeyaert.

**CITY OF MASON
PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 2014-05
A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS
PLAN FOR THE FISCAL YEARS 2014-2019
October 14, 2014**

WHEREAS, the Capital Improvements Plan is a result of significant review and consideration by the City of Mason administrative staff of the numerous capital project requests from City department heads for the next six-year fiscal period; and,

WHEREAS, prioritization of projects listed in the plan is based on the overall benefit to the community, especially when improving public health, safety and welfare, and so that the most-needed projects will be accomplished first and scarce financial resources are allocated appropriately; and,

WHEREAS, the Capital Improvements Plan is consistent with the Capital Improvements Programming component of the Master Plan; and,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the City of Mason Planning Commission does hereby approve the Capital Improvements Plan for fiscal years 2014 – 2019.

RESOLUTION APPROVED

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

No unfinished business at this time.

NEW BUSINESS

No new business at this time.

CORRESPONDENCE

Distributed.

LIAISON REPORTS

- Naeyaert informed commissioners regarding current City Council business.
- Waxman informed commissioners regarding the Sesquicentennial Committee business

DIRECTOR REPORT

Haywood informed the Commission regarding current Zoning & Development business.

ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

No report at this time.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Deborah J. Cwierniewicz, City Clerk

Seth Waxman, Secretary

City of Mason

201 W. Ash St.
P.O. Box 370
Mason, MI 48854-0370
www.mason.mi.us



City Hall 517 676-9155
Police 517 676-2458
Fax 517 676-1330
TDD 1-800-649-3777

MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: David E. Haywood, Zoning & Development Director 

RE: Medical Marihuana–Update

DATE: November 7, 2014

Please refer to the attached memorandum from the City Attorney dated November 5, 2014, detailing the current developments related to the Michigan Medical Marihuana Act. One of the developments is House Bill 4271 that would legalize dispensaries (called provisioning centers in the bill). There are numerous concerns related to this bill that are outlined by the State Attorney General Bill Schutte, The Michigan Association of Police Chiefs, and the Michigan Sheriffs' Association, which include ambiguity, inconsistency with public opinion, patient and child safety, non-deterrence to violations, and provides cover to persons violating the law.

The current moratorium on medical marihuana operations and dispensaries expired in September. In order to provide the City Council, Planning Commission and community adequate time to address this issue, including the fate of pending legislation, it appears necessary to recommend extending the moratorium. Staff will be making this recommendation at the next Council Meeting on November 17.

Included with this memorandum is the memorandum from the City Attorney of November 5, 2014 and attached positions of the State Attorney General, Michigan Association of Police Chiefs and the Michigan Sheriffs' Association. Also included is staff's report from April of this year and a chronology of events to date.

Recommended Action

For discussion only, no action is required at this time.

MEMORANDUM

TO: David Haywood, Zoning and Development Director

FROM: Thomas M. Hitch, Assistant City Attorney *TMH*

RE: **MEDICAL MARIHUANA CASE LAW AND PENDING LEGISLATION
UPDATE**

DATE: November 5, 2014

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide a brief update of recent case law and to review pending legislation.

CASE LAW UPDATE:

The most important decision rendered this year regarding medical marihuana is the decision *Ter Beek v City of Wyoming*, 495 Mich 1 (2014) in which the Michigan Supreme Court held that the City of Wyoming's ordinance, which penalized in its local zoning ordinance any "uses that are contrary to federal law," was preempted and thus void pursuant to the provisions of the Michigan Medical Marihuana Act ("MMMA"). In its opinion, the Supreme Court was fairly broad in its holding that local ordinances are preempted, where it wrote:

Under the Ordinance, individuals are subject to civil punishment for engaging in the medical use of marijuana in accordance with the MMMA; by the plain terms of § 4(a), the manner of that punishment—be it requiring the payment of a monetary sanctions, or denying the ability fo engage in MMMA-compliant conduct—is not material to the MMMA's immunity from it.

It nonetheless held in a footnote that it was not deciding whether the MMMA forecloses all local regulation. In the footnote, the Michigan Supreme Court wrote:

⁹Contrary to the City's concern, this outcome does not "create a situation in the State of Michigan where a person, caregiver or a group of caregivers would be able to operate with no local regulation of their cultivation and distribution of marijuana." *Ter Beek* does not argue, and we do not hold, that the MMMA forecloses all local regulation of marijuana; nor does this case require us to reach

whether and to what extent the MMMA might occupy the field of medical marijuana regulation.

This decision, along with *State of Michigan v McQueen*, 493 Mich 135 (2013), which held that dispensaries, as they are commonly known, are illegal and that sales or transfers between registered patients are illegal as a matter of law, sets the framework for the local regulation of medical marijuana use in Michigan.

There have been no other significant case decisions since the *Ter Beek* decision. The only case citing *Beek* was *Lott v City of Birmingham*, an unpublished decision of the Court of Appeals where the plaintiff sought a declaratory judgment against the City of Birmingham seeking a determination that Birmingham's ordinance was invalid pursuant to the decision in *Beek*. The Court of Appeals held that as the *Beek* decision had already declared that the MMMA superceded a local ordinance which proscribed conduct prevented by federal law, no further declaratory judgment was necessary.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE:

In this legislative update I have included only those bills that have either passed the House or passed the Senate, as it is unlikely in the remaining month and a half that any other bills would be passed by both the House and the Senate in either November or December of this year.

1. The most prominent of the bills is H.B. 4271, which would legalize what is known as dispensaries (calling them "provisioning centers") and would grant local communities the right to either exclude or permit medical marijuana provision centers within their communities. This bill has been strongly criticized by the Attorney General, the Michigan Sheriff's Association, and the Michigan Association of Chiefs of Police. Copies of those comments are attached for your review.

2. H.B. 5104 was also passed by the House but has not been taken up by the Senate. This bill would expand medical marijuana to include "marijuana-infused products" and "useful marijuana equivalents."

3. On the Senate side, S.B. 783 was passed by the Senate but not the House. This bill was drafted in order to make certain forms of conduct illegal, such as in a school bus on the school grounds, or where prohibited by the terms of a written lease.

As the time remaining in this Legislative Session is short, it is not clear that any of these three bills will be adopted this year. Any bill introduced but not adopted by both the House and the Senate die and must be reintroduced in the next session.

RECOMMENDATION:

It appears that the moratorium needs to be reintroduced and adopted if it is to continue. The City Council could, if it desired, also repeal the current ordinance. In any event, the Council may desire to wait further for case law developments as it relates to the boundaries of local regulation. The new Legislature may also adopt a statute establishing those limits. The Council may decide to wait before finally making a determination on the legislative action the City wants (and is able) to take.

bks

Enclosures

cc Marty Colburn w/encs

Ret Ord Draft Med Marihuana



P.O. Box 30212
LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909

BILL SCHUETTE
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Rarely has so little been said or written about proposed legislation that will have such dramatic and profound impact on the character of our communities and the lives of our citizens. After spending a considerable amount of time studying and discussing HB 4271 and HB 5104, we now write to express serious concerns with these two bills.

At first glance, the bills appear to provide a means for medical marihuana patients to secure a ready supply of high-grade marihuana. But on closer inspection, this bill opens the floodgates to the widespread, uncontrolled, and unregulated distribution of marihuana.

Our general concerns can be summarized in these areas:

1. HB 4271 lacks clarity and creates a state of confusion.

Since the enactment of the Michigan Medical Marihuana Act in 2008, there have been years of extensive litigation that have produced a number of court rulings that now guide police and the general public on the lawful possession and use of medical marihuana in Michigan. Instead of building on those guidelines HB 4271 will lead to more years of litigation. Moreover, as written, HB 4271 will have a sweeping impact on the applicability of numerous other State laws while providing minimal guidance to patients, caregivers, law enforcement, or the general public.

There are numerous questions raised by this legislation. Among these are the following:

- a. Where is marihuana legal to sell and where is it prohibited?
- b. Does the new law override any other law that contradicts it? Do motor vehicle, construction and building codes, safety inspections, and other laws get overridden?

- c. Is a person approved to operate a provisioning center required to be a medical marihuana patient or caregiver? If not, then it is far easier to become a distributor rather than a customer, turning common sense and logic on its head.
- d. Is a state university required to permit marihuana provisioning centers to do business on its campus and marihuana deliveries to its students?
- e. Can a convicted drug felon invest in or own a controlling interest in a provisioning center? The proposal only prohibits a convicted drug dealer from being an officer, employee, agent, board member, or operator.
- f. Does the prohibition against any search or inspection by a state official immunize a provisioning center from tax audits, state health and food inspections, or criminal investigation by the State Police?
- g. How will the local regulation of the amount of marihuana purchased from a registered patient or caregiver be meaningful if the patient or caregiver is selling to multiple provisioning centers?
- h. Since the bill only prohibits a provisioning center from operating within 1,000 feet of a primary or secondary school, are distributors allowed to operate near a church, playground, day care center, or other area not conducive to the operation of such a facility?
- i. The bill limits the amount of marihuana a distributor can sell to a particular patient or caregiver. The ability of a patient or caregiver to make purchases from multiple provisioning centers renders this limitation meaningless.
- j. While records must be maintained identifying purchasers of marihuana, why are similar records not required for the identification of the marihuana suppliers? Without strict inventory control and recordkeeping, a provisioning center can easily become a front for an organized drug operation.
- k. Since State/Local Police are prohibited from conducting any inspections or given any authority under this bill, a person making home deliveries for medical marihuana patients could literally have kilos of marihuana in their possession but could not confirm the fact due to the confidentiality in the identity of the customers. This regulatory system will inevitably lead to provisioning centers being used as a front for the illegal distribution of marihuana or the needless arrest of provisioning center employees who are unable to confirm their possession of large amounts of marihuana due to statutory confidentiality.

2. HB 4271 creates a patchwork of regulation.

As written, the legislation allows marihuana distributors to operate in any community in Michigan unless a local unit of government enacts an ordinance to opt out of the expansion. Rather than have one set of rules to guide every distributor and provide uniform guidance to law enforcement officers and the general public, every city or township will have different laws pertaining to the delivery of marihuana. This haphazard approach to drug

enforcement is unprecedented. An individual in Plymouth (if Plymouth prohibited provisioning centers), for example, could be prosecuted for a 4 year felony for selling marihuana out of a dispensary, while a Canton resident (if Canton approved the provisioning centers) would be immune for doing the same activity a mile away. State laws need to be uniform.

3. HB 4271 does not follow the will of The People.

The People of the State of Michigan voted to help people with debilitating conditions and illnesses have access to medical marihuana, not create a legalized for-profit marihuana industry. HB 4271 allows for the profiteering of a schedule 1 controlled substance that is still prohibited by federal law.

4. HB 4271 and HB 5104 does not adequately provide for patient and child safety.

The proposed legislation doubles the amount of marihuana that a caregiver and a patient can possess. There is no adequate testing procedure to monitor the potency of marihuana in solid, liquid, or gaseous form. There are also no standards for the THC content of these items. Consequently, one item may contain five percent THC, while another may contain twenty percent THC. In Colorado, this issue has been directly attributable to six teenage deaths.

The legislation makes no attempt to stop the marketing of marihuana or marihuana products to children. The federal government, anti-tobacco groups, and a lawsuit pressured R. J. Reynolds into stopping the use of the cartoon character "Joe Camel" in its advertising because of the cartoon's appeal to children. Different strains of marihuana are sold under child appealing names such as "Jilly Bean", "Bubble Berry", "Sweet Island Skunk", "Maui Wowie", "Chocolope", "Black Berry", "Afghan Sweet Delicious", "Wonder Woman", "Razzle Dazzle", "Hawaiian Punch", "Orange Kush", "Pineapple Afghan", "Grape Ape", "Blue Magoo", "Strawberry Ice", "Hawaiian Pineapple", "Double Dutch Strawberry", and "Chocolate Chunk". Marihuana-infused products are brownies (Chewy Bud Brownie), peanut butter cookies, chocolate cookies, "Rice Crispy Treat", "Billy Goat Bar", "Fruit Crispy Treat", "Chocolate Rice Crispy Treat", and butter. Other products mimic popular candy and food brands like "Baby Jane", "Stoners", "Reefers", "KronDike", "Pot Tarts", "Gummy Bears", "Cherry Bombs", "Lollipop", and "Kandy Corn". Marihuana-infused drinks are sold in what looks like pop bottles or other carbonated beverages. These products are put into packaging with bright colors or cartoons that appeal to children.

Questions regarding child safety:

- a. As a schedule 1 drug, should not it be mandated that this be dispensed only in child proof containers?
- b. Where is the prohibition on marketing and packaging that entices children to use this schedule 1 drug?
- c. Why is there no mandated warning label on this schedule 1 drug like there is on other drugs?
- d. If marihuana is smoked, why is there no warning label like there is on cigarettes?

5. The Act provides no meaningful deterrence for violators while providing a lucrative marihuana distribution business.

The proposed legislation allows “provisioning centers” to deal in mass quantities of marihuana, with lucrative profits with little to no regulatory oversight. Within the Act there are seventeen potential violations with enumerated penalties. The majority of those violations are simple civil infractions. One is a misdemeanor. Four can be charged under the Public Health Code however, circumvention of the law will not be difficult because the Act contains prohibitions from search or inspection and seizures by law enforcement officers or state regulatory agencies.

6. The new law gives cover to current law breakers.

What happens to existing dispensaries that have been violating the law while others have sought to follow the law? Sec. 3a provides that existing violators of the law and “marihuana profiteers” will be immunized all the while they have been committing felonies.

We call upon you to consider these questions before approving HB 4271 and HB 5104. In a good faith effort to help patients experiencing difficulty obtaining medical marihuana, this bill creates a statutory proposal that is extreme in its lack of regulation or control. It provides an avenue for organized drug dealers to engage in their illegal activities under the guise of a legitimate business.

As elected officials, the people of your district trust that you will research, review and contemplate all legislation that comes before you. Many times your decision can and will, affect their lives and those in the community. We are requesting that you carefully consider the concerns listed about before voting on legislation that if enacted, will have such a wide and sweeping effect on the laws already in place.



TERRENCE L. JUNGEL
MSA EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
620 SOUTH CAPITOL AVENUE
SUITE 320A
LANSING, MICHIGAN 48933
(517) 485-3135
WWW.MISHERIFF.ORG

ROBERT STEVENSON
MACP EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
2133 UNIVERSITY PARK DRIVE
SUITE 200
OKEMOS, MICHIGAN 48864
(517) 349-9420
WWW.MICHIGANPOLICECHIEFS.ORG



September 23, 2014

The Honorable Randy Richardville
Senate Majority Leader
Michigan Senate
PO Box 30036
Lansing, MI 48909

Dear Leader Richardville:

We are writing today to clarify and explain our opposition to HB 4271 and HB 5104, bills that legalize medical marihuana dispensaries and edible, topical, and liquid forms of marihuana for medical use. The Michigan Sheriff's Association (MSA) and Michigan Association of Chiefs of Police (MACP) recognize the bills' intent to allow local control to factor into dispensaries and to find better ways than dangerous inhalation of ingesting or applying medical marihuana. Nevertheless, we remain opposed for the reasons below.

Enforcement of these bills will prove troublesome at best, and impossible at worst. While we believe local units should have the right to refuse to allow dispensaries or zone them away from schools, churches, and neighborhoods if they are made legal, we believe it will be impossible to regulate them at the local level. Differing local standards from community to community will result in a patchwork of confusing ordinances that neither providers nor consumers will be able to understand and quality and safety of the product will suffer. In addition, sheriff offices, police agencies, and local public health departments charged with enforcement and inspection of the dispensaries will have differing standards to enforce within the same county, making enforcement very difficult and costly in time and resources from place to place.

In addition, enforcement of the edible and soluble products is impossible to enforce, given today's technology. For example, HB 5104 indicates a requirement to have no more than one ounce of marihuana per sixteen ounces of edible. There is no way to determine what strength the one ounce of product is, and there is no way to determine if more than one ounce went into the pound of product. There are no standards for potency of different types of marihuana, and there is no way to "unbake" the edible to determine what ratio of food to product exists. In Colorado, these potency issues have resulted in deaths. Because law enforcement cannot forensically determine the quantity of marihuana in a brownie, only that it is there, the bill may very well open the door to protected trafficking of large quantities of marihuana.

The bills also allow a person to sell their excess marihuana to provisioning centers every 60 days. There is no limit on the number of provisioning centers they can sell to in that period. There is also no way to track the sales in real time, let alone sales to multiple provisioning centers. We believe this provision of the bill in its essence legalizes the marihuana trade without enforceable limits. There is no way to know who sold what to whom, where, and when.

Public safety is also a concern. Colorado's experience with full legalization of marihuana can inform Michigan in this regard. Because marihuana possession and use remain federal crimes, most banks will not provide financial services to marihuana dispensaries. This situation has created a cash-heavy business in Colorado, ripe for cash-based crimes like burglary and robbery. A banking system needs to be developed to handle this issue and deter these crimes.

The bills also lack sufficient packaging and labeling requirements. There are no safety provisions in the labeling and packaging requirements such as THC content, child proof containers, a prohibition on brand/product mimicking or appealing to children, and appropriate health warning labels.

Attached to this letter is a list of proposed changes to HB 4271 and HB 5104 to address these concerns and others. Also attached are pertinent news articles for your information on this issue that illustrate our points. Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

Again, at this time we oppose HB 4271 and HB 5104 and urge you to vote no on the bills.

Sincerely,



Terrence L. Jungel
Executive Director
Michigan Sheriffs' Association



Robert M. Stevenson
Executive Director
Michigan Association of Chiefs of Police

cc: Members of the Michigan Senate

Attachments

City of Mason

201 W. Ash St.
P.O. Box 370
Mason, MI 48854-0370
www.mason.mi.us



City Hall 517 676-9155
Police 517 676-2458
Fax 517 676-1330
TDD 1-800-649-3777

MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: David E. Haywood, Zoning & Development Director

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be "DEH", is written over the name "David E. Haywood" in the FROM field.

RE: Medical Marihuana – Ordinance No. 196 & CC Resolution No. 2014-13

DATE: April 9, 2014

Due to the Michigan Supreme Court's (MSC) ruling in the Ter Beek v. Wyoming case earlier this year, municipal regulations that "prohibit uses contrary to federal law" are no longer valid, which consequently invalidates Mason's ordinance. This ruling has left the door open to local municipal regulation once again, but did not provide the manner and extent of "local regulation". All of this means that we are once again, back to the drawing board.

Due to the uncertainty related to this issue, the City Council acted at their March 17, 2014 meeting to adopt an emergency ordinance (Ordinance No. 196) and immediately placed a 180-day moratorium (Resolution No. 2014-13) on issuing any related business licenses until the issue could be studied further.

The Council hinted that the Planning Commission would study the issue, but did not go so far as to make that request formal. One could assume they want to discuss the issue a bit more before they request the Planning Commission to study the issue.

Attached are several documents related to Council's activity on the issue, including the City Attorney's opinion and recommendation of February 27, 2014, Ordinance No. 196 and Resolution No. 2014-13. One other reference to keep close at hand is the February 2014 issue of the Planning and Zoning News that provides an in depth analysis of the MSC's ruling.

Recommended Action

No action is required at this time.

City of Mason

201 W. Ash St.
P.O. Box 370
Mason, MI 48854-0370
www.mason.mi.us



City Hall 517 676-9155
Police 517 676-2458
Fax 517 676-1330
TDD 1-800-649-3777

MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: David E. Haywood, Zoning & Development Director

RE: Master Plan Implementation Strategy – Sub-area Plans

DATE: November 7, 2014

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of several loops and a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

The Sub-area Plan Steering Committee has drafted a preliminary mission statement and list of issues and potential players relative to each of the sub-areas identified in the Master Plan, the Cedar Street Interchange and the Airport/Fairgrounds East Buffer areas. Attached are the notes from meetings held by the Committee.

Recommended Action:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission discuss the attached notes and provide comment and suggested changes or improvements. Steering Committee members should provide their insights as well.

Next Step:

Upon approval of changes, the Planning Commission then may proceed with selecting an ad hoc committee to begin the work of developing a plan.

Mason Planning Commission
Sub-Area Steering Committee
Meeting Notes of September 9, 2014 and October 1, 2014

Meeting Purpose: To create a mission statement for each sub area and a list of community players that will be invited to serve on an ad-hoc study committee.

Mission Statement: To create a award winning policy guidance plan for future development by creating a vision through a wide-based community input process that takes into consideration the following issues:

Airport & County Fairgrounds East Buffer Planning Areas

- Provide a buffer to planned residential areas
- Delineate uses within mixed use area further
- Future land uses should be compatible with existing residential on Dexter Trail
- Direct industrial traffic south to Kipp Road
- Study safety impacts of additional traffic on intersection of Kipp and Eden/Barnes
- Consult with MDOT for optimal new road connection points to M-36
- Utilize Avery Road for future development at east side of study area
- Study possible locations of new entrances to study area to alleviate industrial/commercial/residential traffic conflicts
- Consider land uses that would be complimentary (not competitive) to the Central Business District
- Redefine/refine boundary of Fairgrounds East Buffer and Airport Areas
- Fade intensity of land uses from industrial at the south west corner to commercial to the north and fade to residential eastward
- Recognize airport overlay zoning as established in the Capital Region Airport Authority master plan
- Recognize the City's wellhead protection plan
- Possibly provide incentives for LEED buildings
- Provide adequate/necessary buffer to water treatment plant
- Conduct build-out study
- Future neighborhood parks
- Incorporate community trail system
- Incentives for shared parking
- Avoid single-story buildings
- Encourage higher density
- Establish character goals

- Incorporate transect planning principles
- Incorporate smart growth principles
- Incorporate placemaking principles
- Consider professional planning consultant services

Players:

- Involve property owners/occupants immediately adjacent and internal to study areas
- Mason Public Schools
- Ingham County Fair
- Capital Region Airport Authority
- Vevay Township
- Ingham County Road Department
- Michigan Department of Transportation
- Ingham County Drain Commissioner
- Lansing Economic Area Partnership
- Tri-County Regional Planning Commission
- Ingham County Land Bank Authority
- Sparrow Health System
- Developers/Realtors

Cedar Street Interchange Planning Area

- Allow/permit highest and best land uses
- Land uses and structure should be compatible to existing development pattern
- Impact on existing utilities
- Diversify economic portfolio
- Traffic access/compatibility
- Entertainment district/village concept
- Walkable mix of land uses – walksheds of 5 min./1/4 mile
- Character/Form-base code
- Hotel
- City government participation to problem solve (i.e. vehicular access point, ect.)
- Tax incentives for commercial
- Grants for street construction
- Impact on existing neighborhoods and businesses
- Maximize density
- Incorporate placemaking principles
- Consider professional planning consultant services

Players:

- Dart Container
- Ingham County Sherriff

- Ingham County Drain Commissioner
- Michigan Department of Transportation
- Ingham County Road Department
- Involve property owners/occupants immediately adjacent and internal to study areas
- Mason Elevator
- Michigan Department of Environmental Quality
- Mason Public Schools
- Tri-County Regional Planning Commission
- Lansing Economic Area Partnership
- Developers/Realtors
- Sparrow Health System