



**FLINT MASTER PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE**  
**Meeting Notes**  
**December 15, 2015**



**Members Present:**

Judy Hovey  
Councilwoman Poplar  
Pamela Hawkins  
Linda Boose  
Paul Mattern  
Councilwoman VanBuren  
John Henry

Charles Tutt  
Raynetta Speed  
Elizabeth Jordan  
Sandra Robinson  
Bob Wesley  
Jim Richardson

**Members Not Present:**

Bryant Nolden  
Richard Boone  
Barry Williams

Isaiah Oliver  
Clarence Pierce  
Mona Monroe-Younis - Excused

**Staff Present**

Kevin Schronce  
Jonathan Moore  
Joel Arnold

Claire Nowak-Boyd  
Isaac DeGraaf

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Co-Chair Jim Richardson called the meeting to order at 5:35 pm. The meeting was held at the Flint Public Library, 1026 Kearsley St., Flint, MI room 205.

**PUBLIC FORUM:**

Co-Chair Richardson stated that this is a working meeting of the Master Plan Steering Committee. Therefore, public comment will be limited to the first ten minutes in order to allow for dialogue between Steering Committee members.

**PLANNING COMMISSION UPDATE:**

Co-Chair Richardson called on Bob Wesley to give the Planning Commission update. He took the time to introduce Clarie Nowak-Boyd, who was recently hired for the position of Planner I in the City of Flint's Zoning/Case Management office.

**DRAFT ZONING CODE DISCUSSION:**

Co-Chair Richardson called on Kevin Schronce to begin discussion on the zoning code. Mr. Schronce began by explaining that Planning staff is wrapping up an internal review of the most recent draft and is currently working on adding and improving graphics and images in the code. Prior to discussing the most recent graphics Jim Richardson stopped the proceedings to introduce Brian Larkin, who has been hired to fill Megan's old position as Director of Planning and Development for the City of Flint. Mr. Larkin proceeded to introduce himself and applauded the committee for their hard work in developing the Master Plan; citing their attendance tonight as evidence that they are committed to the implementation stage of the plan. Co-Chair Richardson then handed it back to Mr. Schronce to continue the discussion of graphics in the code.

Mr. Schronce began by showing examples of the most recent graphics and images to be added to the code. The first image depicted how to measure building height for three different types of structures. Mr. Schronce proceeded to explain that images such as this one can be used to support the surrounding text in the code and can hopefully make interpreting aspects of the code more straight forward. He also explained the city would like to compile a quick reference guide of certain aspects of the code to assist in making the code more user friendly. Ms. Robinson asked if basements have regulations since one of

The buildings in the graphic depicted a basement. Ms. Jordan answered by explaining those regulations would be determined based on the building code. This led to a brief discussion about updating the building code but Mr. Schronce explained the City uses the State of Michigan's building code and that the state would be in charge of any updating.

Mr. Schronce then continued providing examples of graphics to be used in the code. They included images such as transparency requirements, swimming pool placement, deck and patio placement, clear vision areas and many more. Mr. Henry commented on an image depicting commercial waste receptacles asking if the gates depicted in the image would be required. He explained his concern would be if the trash collector vehicles are able to access the receptacles because he has heard gates have sometimes gotten in the way of the waste collection. He advised looking into the matter further to decide on the correct course of action.

The discussion turned to a graphic depicting corner visual clearance for signs and Ms. Poplar asked how long it will be till we can get the signage code in place because she believes it should be one of the first things we need to address. Mr. Schronce explained that the current draft states that all non-conforming signs must be changed after a period of 5 years. Ms. Poplar believed 5 years was too long but Co-Chair Wesley clarified that the signs Ms. Poplar wants to fix can be classified as temporary signs and therefore the five year amortization period wouldn't be necessary for the present situation. Ms. Jordan added a primary reason for the 5 year period is to compensate for the higher cost of permanent signs but the temporary signs Ms. Poplar is referring to are actually illegal in the current code. Mr. Larkin chimed in that the easiest way to address the problem immediately is through enhanced code enforcement. Co-Chair Richardson presented Ms. Poplar's idea of approving one section of the code and then passing the rest by asking if it would be possible. Mr. Schronce replied that he wouldn't advise passing one section without the rest because the articles build on each other and therefore it is best to get the whole thing passed at once. Ms. Hovey then moved the discussion along by stating that she believed the added imagery will be a good tool to get residents and neighborhoods more involved in development going on around their neighborhood but that too often neighborhoods don't know about projects early enough.

Mr. Schronce then finished up showcasing the remaining graphics. Ms. Poplar commented on the wind turbine graphic stating it is another important piece that needs to get put in place because there has already been some companies coming to the administration about wind energy and they will be waiting until the new code gets passed before continuing the process. Mr. Henry then commented on an outdoor seating graphic that depicted a necessary 5 feet minimum pedestrian space. He thought 5 feet seemed too small particularly in places like downtown. Ms. Jordan added that the current requirement is 3 feet.

Mr. Schronce then moved to discussion to the next topic for the evening, Green Innovation Districts. He wanted to hear the committee's thoughts on developing two separate green innovation districts based mostly on location and the surrounding district. He explained a district of GI-1 would be in green innovation districts surrounded by mostly residential. This district would call for more special uses and therefore would put processes in place for more regulation. In terms of scale GI-1 would be less intense than GI-2. GI-2 would be located among old industrial sites and in areas surrounded by zones such as production center and commerce and employment. This district would allow some uses by right that could then allow for development to occur with less roadblocks. Ms. Jordan expressed the balance the committee must think about is making things easier to promote development vs what things we would like to be able to approve. Mr. Tutt asked how can you check that the use doesn't impact residents in the area and Mr. Schronce responded by saying if it is a use that is going to cause a disruption then we would guide/connect them to GI-2 districts that will be away from residential zones. Co-Chair Richardson asked if anyone could see anything illogical in what Mr. Schronce was presenting. Mr. Tutt replied we need to be flexible enough to monitor what's happening and Ms. Hovey said she would like to continue with the idea and see the proposed standards. Mr. Schronce replied they would probably be most similar to production center and/or commerce and employment center. Co-Chair Richardson then asked for any additional comments before moving on to the timeline for adapting the code.

#### **ZONING CODE REVISIONS UPDATE:**

Mr. Schronce then presented a time-line for finishing the revisions of the code and the process of getting it adopted. The committee voted for the next two steering committee meetings to occur January 5, 2016 and February 16, 2016.

#### **MEETING ADJOURNMENT:**

Co-chair Richardson adjourned the meeting at 7:15 pm and thanked everyone for their input.