

Courtney Nicholls

From: Courtney Nicholls
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2010 3:00 PM
To: Courtney Nicholls
Subject: Village Update

Village of Dexter E-Mail Update

The ice rink is closed for the season. If you have any feedback on this pilot project please either reply to this e-mail or contact Allison Bishop at 734-426-8303 x15 or abishop@villageofdexter.org. We would like to thank Green Guys Lawn Care, Lions Club, Dexter Daze Committee, Rotary Club, Think Dexter First and the Dexter Chamber for their support. Thank you also to the Athletic Booster Club of Dexter (ABCD) and the Dexter Educational Support Personnel Association (DESPA) for helping with refreshments.

The Village is requesting proposals for Downtown Landscape Maintenance Services. Call the Village Office at 734-426-8303 or stop in at 8123 Main Street to request a copy of the proposal submittal document. Proposals must be received by 5:00 p.m. Wednesday, March 24, 2010.

Yesterday representatives from the Village met with the State Boundary Commission (SBC) survey staff about our Cityhood petition that was submitted in November 2009. Village residents will recall that the Village presented the petition at the Boundary Commission's February meeting. The comments provided by the SBC recommended that we provide additional detail in our proposed legal description to make it clearer and less ambiguous. The purpose of this meeting was to review their concerns and understand how to improve our description. Below is a synopsis of the two topics that were discussed at the meeting provided by Village President Shawn Keough:

Review of Legal Description

The surveyors were helpful in providing examples of the language that they would like to see in our Village legal description. They passed out an example of another description that they had prepared to provide an introduction into what they were looking for. They also offered a couple of suggestions on how to better describe the areas near the railroad and Mill Creek. Our surveyors were able to ask the questions they needed and it seemed like they got the answers that they needed. I expect that our next petition submittal will be much better received and that we made significant progress toward understanding what they consider to be clear and unambiguous.

Contiguity

We brought up the issue of Contiguity as it relates to our next petition submittal and asked for some opinions from the State Surveyors on this issue. Just so that everyone is clear, contiguity is not an issue that the SBC evaluates as part of its determination of legal sufficiency, however, once a petition is found to be legally sufficient, it is clearly an issue that they will address as they set the public hearing on the proposed boundary. Our goal was to get some insight yesterday on what the surveyors thought the SBC would be looking for from the Village in order to address the issue of contiguity going forward.

Our previous petition clearly was submitted with 3 individual boundary areas that currently do not touch each other (the Scio portion of Dexter, the Westridge Subdivision and the Cedars of Dexter). Westridge

of Dexter is separated from the Scio portion of the Village by the Railroad tracks and Mill Creek and the Cedars of Dexter is across Dexter Pinckney Road from Westridge. The State surveyors indicated that if we did not propose a boundary with some level of contiguity as part of our next petition, then the SBC would likely get out there "magic pen" and draw what they would like to see commented on at the public hearing which would be the next step following a determination of legal sufficiency. We expressed concerns about "too much drawing" and indicated that we knew of several areas that did not want to be drawn into the proposed City boundary (i.e. Bates Farms, etc..). We expressed to the Boundary Commission staff that it was our desire to not add any more land than necessary as part of our request to incorporate, and that to this point in the process we had hoped not to add any if we didn't need to.

Given that contiguity is likely going to be a requirement going forward, we asked about how we could meet the contiguity requirement at a minimum level. I believe that Council needs to discuss the merits of having OHM prepare a contiguous boundary for our next petition rather than putting this decision in the hands of the State Boundary Commission. Doing so ahead of time as part of our next petition submittal would allow us to explain why we chose such a boundary and would likely prevent them from establishing boundaries that we do not desire. We discussed ideas such as drawing in portions of Mill Creek to connect the main part of the Village with Westridge. Because the Cedars of Dexter and the Westridge Subdivision are in the SW corner of Webster Twp, it is very likely that we will need to draw in another portion of Webster Twp that is covered by the existing 425 agreement, and the logical choice is the Gordon Hall property as part of our new petition. If we do not include this property, it will be very difficult for the SBC to accept our boundary because our contiguous boundary would isolate the Gordon Hall property from the rest of Webster Twp. We will get a map together and better illustrate this point at the next Council meeting so that it is clearer to all. We will likely also have to consider including portions of Dexter Pinckney Road to help connect the Cedars of Dexter, and need to discuss whether or not we need to bring in the Mill Creek Sporting Goods property and possibly Main Street in that area.

I am openly sharing this information even though I know that adding land to our petition and proposed legal description is a sensitive topic. Please remember that this information is meant to be informative in nature at this time. I think it is very important for us to have a discussion on these issues at the next Council meeting, so please look for this item on the next Village Council agenda.

Village representatives will be attending the March 18th meeting of the State Boundary Commission. At this meeting, we expect the SBC to formally vote on the legal sufficiency of our first petition. Based on the February meeting and the comments received prior to that meeting, we expect that the SBC will find our first petition submittal to be legally insufficient. We know the Cityhood process is of interest to many residents in the Village and we will provide another update after that meeting.

Courtney L. Nicholls
Village of Dexter
Assistant Village Manager
734-426-8303 ext. 17

This message was sent to those who have requested to be placed on the Village of Dexter e-mail list. If you would like your e-mail address removed please respond to this e-mail with "remove my address" in the subject.