

**VEVAY TOWNSHIP**  
**BOARD OF TRUSTEES/PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**Special Joint Meeting**  
**Wednesday, March 4, 2015**  
**Vevay Township Hall – 7:00 p.m.**

---

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES MINUTES**

**Board Members Present:** Supervisor Gary Howe, Clerk JoAnne Kean, Treasurer Shaun Sherwood, Trustees Bruce Walker & Douglas Shaw  
**PC Members Present:** Chair Ilene Thayer, Jack Cady, Roger Cargill, John Lazet, Patricia McNeilly, Coe Emens III & Bruce Walker (sitting as a member of the Board of Trustees)  
**Staff Present:** Planning Consultant Mark Eidelson & Deputy Clerk Brett Linsley

The meeting was called to order by Supervisor Howe at 7:03 p.m. and followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

Clerk Kean – Thanked Planner Eidelson for his time and efforts in recompiling the Zoning Ordinance to include its twenty-four amendments. Supervisor Howe – added that an updated zoning map will be required.

**Adopt/Amend Agenda.** No additions or amendments were made to the agenda.

**Public Comment.** None.

**Master Plan Orientation Document.** Planner Eidelson – explained that the purpose of this meeting will be to review the approved process outlined in the orientation document he had previously provided to the Board and Planning Commission (PC). He (Eidelson) also reviewed the requirements of the Planning Enabling Act, particularly regarding notifying residents and neighboring municipalities about the Master Plan update.

Board/PC – discussed the process of notifying residents of Vevay Township as well as municipalities who are contiguous to our Township regarding this project.. It was noted that persons of interest may receive information about the process if they submit a written request. Only residents of Vevay Township and the officials in contiguous municipalities will automatically receive notifications. Unless the Township’s letter of intent specifies otherwise, all drafts must be submitted in hard copy. Planner Eidelson – highly recommended using the letter of intent to specify that electronic drafts will be the primary source of communication as doing so would cut reproduction costs significantly. Residents and other units of government may, however, request hard copies.

Planner Eidelson – in response to questions posed by Trustee Walker:

- The terms “draft Master Plan” and “proposed Master Plan,” as presented in the orientation document, are synonymous for all intents and purposes.
- Because the Master Plan is not simply being amended but rewritten under a new law, it should be considered a *new* Plan as opposed to a *revised* or *updated* one.
- The term “preservation” will retain the purposefully-broad meaning it has in the current Master Plan; primarily referring to saving natural resources or space for future use.

Planner Eidelson – Several drafts of the Master Plan may be explored, but the PC will ultimately be required to determine a proposed draft that will be reviewed at a Public Hearing. The law requires the PC to present this proposed plan to the Board of Trustees who can approve or reject the plan for distribution to the public. Should the Board reject the proposed Plan, they must advise the PC of any concerns. Consistent communication between both bodies would be pivotal in avoiding this situation.

Planner Eidelson – said that by law the PC retains final approving authority of the Master Plan unless the Board takes that authority upon itself by resolution. The issue does not pose a major obstacle as the Board’s approval to distribute the proposed plan constitutes an implicit authorization of the document. Trustee Walker – requested that the issue of final approving authority be considered by the Board further at an upcoming meeting.

Planner Eidelson – reminded the Board and PC that at their last joint meeting they had decided to pursue an alternative that included distribution of a survey to residents and land owners in the Township. He (Eidelson) would meet with the PC in April and May to review and make necessary changes to a draft survey. LANDPLAN has usually elicited the most responses by requesting a two-week response time. Postage and mailing the survey will be the Township’s responsibility. LANDPLAN will collect and organize responses. Clerk Kean – noted that both mailing and receiving responses for the survey during May could be helpful to residents who will start the summer holiday in June. It would also allow an announcement about the survey to be made in the Township’s upcoming spring newsletter. The PC agreed to meet a second time in April to expedite the survey process.

Board/PC – briefly discussed the potential of sending the survey in an electronic format. Clerk Kean – noted that the Township does not have electronic contact information for most of its residents. Planner Eidelson – agreed to provide an electronic copy of the survey for the Township to use should it so choose.

Planner Eidelson – explained the survey responses will be used as a tool for revisiting the issues the PC has previously identified during its review of the Master Plan. Revisions will be compiled into a draft that will be reviewed multiple times before being sent to the Board for distribution

approval. Sixty-three days after the Township has notified adjoining municipalities, the PC will hold a Public Hearing that could result in the need for substantive changes to the proposed plan.

Planner Eidelson – reviewed the estimated fees and schedule for the process. A fourteenth month process is feasible but not absolute.

Trustee Walker – asked for a question regarding phone coverage, internet access, and cable in the Township to be considered as a component of the survey.

Board/PC – discussed at length various mailing methods, the Township’s access to mailing addresses, and who should receive the survey. The Township’s software package includes addresses and owner names for each land parcel – this means only taxpayer names are available. The proprietors of the Mason Manor mobile home park have been willing to assist in distribution of documents to residents in the past.

**The Board/PC reached a consensus to send the survey to all parcels that have a residence, as well as to any open parcel with a non-resident owner, but without duplication. Return postage will also be affixed.**

Mr. Eidelson – addressed concerns about survey formats and questions that may seem to intentionally lead residents to respond in generic ways. While closed-ended questions can often be leading, the inclusion of an “other comments” section would allow residents to clarify their answers or present other concerns not addressed by the survey.

**Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 8:42 p.m.

---

JoAnne Kean, Clerk

*Transcribed by Deputy Clerk Brett Linsley  
March 2015 Joint Meeting BOT Minutes.doc*