PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
December 17, 2014
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER
7:00 P.M.

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:02 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Present: R. Johnson, C. Zuellig, H. Jugenitz, N. Sandberg, A. Bedogne, P. Hollifield

Absent: Scott Straley (excused)

Staff: Bonnie Wessler, Planner II
Nan Schuette, Executive Secretary

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Jugenitz moved to approve the minutes of November 19, 2014 as read (Support: P. Hollifield) and the motion carried unanimously.

IV. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

None

V. PRESENTATIONS AND PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

None

VI. NEW BUSINESS

1. 6 year city-Wide Capital Improvements Plan

Ms. Wessler distributed a list of projects that were identified by the City Manager, Finance Director and Director of Planning to be included for consideration. The Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) is a multi-year planning document that is used to identify needs and financing sources for public infrastructure. A CIP facilitates coordinated infrastructure improvements; maintains reserves and protects the City's existing infrastructure system and capital assets; and provides for the acquisition of scheduled replacement of equipment to ensure the efficient delivery of services to the community. These projects and improvements are major non-recurring tangible assets and projects that are greater or equal to $10,000. The CIP plans for large, physical improvements or purchases that are permanent in nature.

The CIP plays an important role by providing the link between planning and budgeting for capital expenditures to consistency with City long-range goals and objectives. The CIP process occurs prior to the budget process and will be used by Council to develop the capital portion of the municipal budget. The City of Ypsilanti's Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) outlines a schedule of public service expenditures over the ensuing six year period (FY2015-2021) and is based on input from each City department.

There are a number of advantages to a Capital Improvements Plan, i.e. more predictable and transparent of capital spending; coordination between needs and operational budgets; better schedule of public improvements; etc.

Once the CIP has been adopted by City Council, it becomes a statement of city policy regarding the timing location, character and funding of future capital projects.

Ms. Wessler explained to the board that this was being presented to get feedback from the Planning Commission and that no resolution is required. She also distributed a Project Prioritization Criteria, which is broken into two stages – a scoring system and also by priority, which she explained in detail. She also explained the difference between what a capital improvement is and maintenance.

A number of questions were asked by board members – Ms. Wessler stated the list is a giant "to do" list. It could be something that was requested in the previous budget cycle that was not approved so some of the items were taken from that list. One change that was made is removal of neighborhoods and area, which is now broken down into Wards making it more transparent since it will be used by City Council for their budget purposes. The proposed year is basically a "place holder", which will be dictated by the prioritization major. This list is for a six-year period; however, staff will do a "refresh" every year. Chairman Johnson recommended that language should be included in the plan to reflect the review on a yearly basis.

Ms. Wessler responded to all questions including lighting and the Cross Street Bridge, and the possibility of putting money aside on an annual basis in order to have the full amount for a project. Ms. Wessler stated that the latter is a question that would have to be deferred to the Financial Director.

Commissioner Sandberg pointed out small errors on Pages 3, 8 and 9 to be corrected.

The next step is to take the feedback by the board members to the Capital Improvements Committee, after which, Ms. Wessler will come back to the Planning Commission for approval, hopefully in January.

2. Disposition Policy Draft

Ms. Wessler explained that this is a draft policy for tax foreclosure reverted properties. Recently, a number of properties have been returned to the City from the County after they failed to sell at tax foreclosure auction. The City now has the option to accept or reject these properties but has not taken a position on how to review or potentially handle these properties. Ms. Wessler referred to a draft policy/process for making recommendations for disposition of previous acquisitions the City has received through the tax foreclosure and would be applied to any properties acquired in the future. She is looking for feedback from the Planning Commission on the process itself and recommendations for the disposition of the properties she had included in the staff report dated December 11, 2014.

Commissioner Sandberg asked how many properties are involved and how often this occurs. Ms. Wessler said there were only a few properties and they are only returned on a yearly basis.

Commissioner Zuellig suggested that the public needs to be made aware of the available properties for lease/sale – recommends notification to people w/in 300 ft, the same as we do for special uses or variances, prior to going to City Council for appropriate action.

3. Non-Motorized Commission

Included in the packet were the meeting minutes for September, October, November and December as well as the 2015 Calendar of Meetings. Ms. Wessler also referred to the appointments/reappointments of the Non-Motorized Commission asking for approval. Commissioner Bedogne moved to approve the new appointment of Sarah Walsh and re-appointments of Cheryl Weber and Bob Krzewinski to the Non-Motorized Commission (Support: C. Zuellig) and the motion carried unanimously.

4. 2015 Schedule of Meetings

Commissioner Sandberg moved to approve the Planning Commission 2015 Schedule of Meetings (Support: H. Jugenitz) and the motion carried unanimously.

VII. OLD BUSINESS

None

VIII. FUTURE BUSINESS DISCUSSION/UPDATES

1. Capital Improvement Plan
2. Staff changes
3. Commissioner Jugenitz asked if the board could use the January meeting as an opportunity to do a case study on a former variance request/special use that came before the board using the new zoning ordinance. Possible 706 W. Michigan or Urgent Care.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Since there was no further business, Commissioner Bedogne moved to adjourn the meeting (Support: P. Hollifield). The meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.