

Natural Features Protection Review Board
October 8, 2019
Meeting Minutes

Community Room, Second Floor, City Hall, 241 W. South Street

4:00 p.m.

A. Meeting called to order by the board chair at 4:00 PM.

B. Members present:

Bobby Glasser

Kyle Martin

Paul MacNellis

Mitch Lettow

Erin Fuller

Members absent:

Ashley Cole Wick

Alan Sylvester

Staff present:

Jamie McCarthy

Nolan Bergstrom

C. A motion was made by Paul MacNellis to adopt the agenda as presented, supported by Erin Fuller. The motion passed by voice vote.

D. A motion was made by Paul MacNellis to adopt the minutes from the September 24, 2019 meeting, supported by Erin Fuller. The motion passed by voice vote.

E. New Business:

- I. The NFP Board debriefed following the slope variance request at the meeting on September 24 petitioned by Spartan Services Partners, LLC for 3825 Stadium Drive. The board reviewed the process and the standards by which projects must be evaluated to meet the requirements for a variance.

The NFP Board discussed the broader site plan review process, which departments or city staff are responsible for which portions of site plan review, what permits and inspections take place and when (to ensure site plan compliance), and what information is required at site plan review versus permitting (i.e., stamped engineering drawing). The NFP Board is interested in having engineering staff at one of the board meetings to further explain the process.

F. Old Business:

1. The NFP Board was introduced to Nolan Bergstrom as the new NFP intern in CP&ED. Nolan is a graduate student at Western Michigan University studying regional and urban planning. Nolan will be assisting the City in phase 2 of the NFP mapping process with guidance from the NFP Board.

Ms. McCarthy started the discussion by reminding the board of key objectives used in phase 1 of the NPF process, including: 1) scientifically defensible, 2) does not preclude development, 3) protective of natural features, and 4) phase 2 will consider whether other mechanisms are necessary to protect natural features. The board discussed categories of natural features including how to prioritize woodland protection (is there an acreage or percent canopy cover goal we need to define?), how best to prioritize slopes (intersection with other natural features?), where are the gaps in the current overlay district, buffer zones and edge effects, and outstanding sections for floodplains and wildlife corridors.

Board members reviewed the current overlay district with staff, and Nolan provided maps of publicly available datasets. The board suggested Nolan research available data to enhance the district to protect the natural features:

- Compare the State's GIS hydrology layer and National Wetlands Inventory data with the existing overlay district to determine which features adjacent to water and wetlands would need to be added to the district to protect riparian areas and water quality.
- Determine how to prioritize and protect important slopes or geologic features that are not currently included in the overlay district.
- What criteria should be used to identify and prioritize woodlands for protection?
- Are there other features or priorities that have not be considered when developing the overlay district?

- G. Board Comments (none)
- H. Citizen Comments (none)
- L. Meeting adjourned at 5:30 PM.



Signature

Mitchell Letlow, Board Chair

Printed name, title



Signature

Jamie McCarthy

Printed name, recording secretary