

**SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
FREMONT AREA JOINT PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES**

**Monday, March 21, 2005
5:00 – 6:45 PM
Fremont City Hall
Court Room**

I. Call to Order.

Richard Rought called the meeting to order at 5:00 PM.

Subcommittee Members Present: Sheridan Township: Jack Taylor, Planning Commissioner
Dayton Township: Shirley Hooker, Dayton Township Trustee
City of Fremont: James Breinling, Fremont Mayor Pro Tem
City of Fremont: Richard Rought, Fremont Zoning Administrator
City of Fremont: Michele Ribant, Fremont City Director of
Neighborhood & Economic Development

Subcommittee Members Absent: Dayton Township: Charles Witteveen, Planning Commissioner &
Chair, Fremont Area Joint Planning Committee
Sherman Township: Joan Obits, Sherman Township Supervisor

II. Discussion on which Project to Pursue in a Joint Planning Arrangement

Jack Taylor began the discussion by indicating that any proposed joint planning arrangement should provide for the Joint Planning Commission to have official authority over any decisions that are to be made. He indicated that the Fremont Area Joint Planning Committee currently has only advisory authority and that its function may not be understood within the community. The other Subcommittee members agreed with Mr. Taylor.

Shirley Hooker stated that she would like something concrete to bring to her Board that outlines where the boundaries of the joint planning effort might be. She would also like to provide her Board with some model language that outlines how the Joint Planning agreement could be structured. Jim Breinling felt that the Subcommittee should come up with the Joint Planning area and models at this meeting, which could then be presented to each Township Board and the City Council for input.

The Subcommittee decided to pursue a joint planning arrangement for planning purposes that would include all five government units, including the City of Fremont and Dayton, Sheridan Charter, Sherman and Garfield Townships.

III. Discussion on Jurisdictional Area that would be subject to a Joint Agreement

After much discussion, the Subcommittee decided the area that would be subject to a joint agreement should be around the periphery of the City in approximately ¼- to ½-mile increments. The attached map depicts the jurisdictional area that the Subcommittee determined should be subject to planning oversight by any proposed joint commission.

Mr. Breinling indicated it is important that we have a unified voice within the jurisdictional area that is covered for planning purposes by any proposed joint planning commission. He indicated that any proposed development should first be brought before the Joint Planning Commission by a developer rather than any municipality's Planning Commission. He went on to say that all five

municipalities want to reduce sprawl and encourage smart growth, so we all want the same type of development.

IV. Discussion on Model Agreement to be presented to each Government Unit

The Subcommittee decided to create a model of an agreement that could be adopted by each participating local governing body. At the outset, the Subcommittee decided to create one model agreement that would have official authority over any planning project proposed in the designated jurisdictional area and one model agreement that would have *advisory* authority over any planning projects proposed in the designated jurisdictional area. The Subcommittee decided the following provisions should be addressed in the model agreements:

Planning Act: It was decided that the Township Planning Act should be used rather than the Municipal Planning Act. It was thought that the Township Planning Act is more recent and flexible.

Composition of Commission: The Subcommittee indicated that ideally one Council/Board member and one Planning Commission member from each governmental unit should serve on the Joint Planning Commission. However, since typically there are only 5 – 9 members on a joint planning commission, it would not be feasible, so the following was decided.

Model Agreement with *Official Authority*: This model would include nine members with the following representation:

- 3 members from City: One Councilmember
Two Planning Commission members
- 2 members from Dayton: One Board Trustee
One Planning Commission member
- 2 members from Sheridan: One Board Trustee
One Planning Commission member
- 1 member from Garfield: Garfield can decide whether they want a Board Trustee or a Planning Commission member
- 1 member from Sherman: Sherman can decide whether they want a Board Trustee or a Planning Commission member

Model Agreement with only *Advisory Authority*: This model would include five members with one member from each governmental unit. Each unit could decide whether they wanted a Council/Board member or a Planning Commission member to serve on the Joint Planning Commission on their behalf.

Terms of Service: It was suggested that the terms of service of each member be staggered, 1-3 year terms and that individuals be appointed rather than elected. It was also suggested that members should be a resident of the government unit they represent. These suggestions could apply to either of the two models.

Budget: A discussion took place in terms of how the operating budget would be shared; however, no consensus was reached.

Zoning Act: A discussion took place in terms of the applicable zoning act whose procedures would be followed when exercising a zoning responsibility or when exercising any other power or performing any other duty under the zoning enabling acts. No consensus was reached.

Mr. Taylor indicated that we should include other provisions, such as how a municipality can join or withdraw from the Joint Planning Commission. It was decided that City staff would develop two models for the joint agreement that could be proposed to the five governmental units interested in forming a joint planning arrangement.

Mr. Taylor reiterated that he felt that any proposed model should provide for the Joint Planning Commission to have official authority. After some discussion, it was decided that two models should be developed as follows:

1. A model that would have *official authority for Planning* purposes and *advisory authority for Zoning* purposes.
2. A model that would have official authority for both *Planning* and *Zoning* purposes.

City staff agreed to have the map of the proposed jurisdictional area as well as two model agreements ready for review at the next Subcommittee meeting, which was set for Monday, April 11, 2005 at 4:30 PM in the Court Room at Fremont City Hall.

V. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Michele Ribant
Director, Neighborhood & Economic Development
City of Fremont