

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

TYRONE TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

Draft Regular Meeting Minutes

April 12, 2005 7:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Sally Eastman, Dave Hanoute, Richard Hartigan, Steve Hasbrouck, S. Randy Laue,
Laurie Radcliffe

ABSENT: Joe Fumich, Steve Hasbrouck

CALL TO ORDER: 7:30 p. m. by Vice-Chairman Hartigan

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

CALL TO THE PUBLIC: No response.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA: Approved as presented:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 22, 2005, approved as corrected:

Page 6, Line 16: (...because of the **typing tying** hours.)

Page 6, Line 42: (...we needed **to** establish some standards...)

CORRESPONDENCE:

April 5, 2005 - Final draft of the open space ordinance language to be forwarded to the Township Board, County Planning Department, and County Planning Commission.

There were no comments regarding the final draft and Vice-Chairman Hartigan asked that the Open Space language be forwarded as presented to the Livingston County Planning Department, the Livingston County Planning Commission and the Township Board for approval in connection with the other revisions discussed at the Public Hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT:

- 1) Request of **Joseph M. Wright** for state statute land division of property at 13200 Woodland Trail, RE parcel 01-300-022, to create proposed "Parcel A" (approximately 118346 square feet net, including open space) and "Parcel B" (approximately 109628 square feet net, including open space). A total open space area of 43,575 square feet has been divided between the two parcels.

Mr. Hanoute explained that the Subcommittee had requested a revised drawing showing an open space calculation chart, the location of the wetland area, and an open space maintenance agreement. The revised drawing (dated February 7, 2005) indicated that the open space had been calculated on the gross area, rather than the net area and was more than was needed. Mr. Wright said he was satisfied with the land division as presented.

1 MOTION: Moved by Hanoute, seconded by Radcliffe, to recommend to the
2 Township Board approval of Mr. Wright's state statute land division request to
3 create proposed "Parcel A" and proposed "Parcel B" as shown in the February 7,
4 2005 site drawing with the understanding that the land division does not guarantee
5 that the parcel will meet the building requirements of the township. Motion carried
6 by voice vote.
7

8
9 **OLD BUSINESS:**

10
11 **1) Discussion of revisions to the Master Plan text regarding "Overall Regulations for Planned
12 Development" in connection with the PIRO district**

13
14 Mr. Fecho, Township Planner, commented that the PIRO language (dated 4/12/05) was
15 proposed to replace the text currently shown on page 82 of the Master Plan. The map
16 which had been prepared earlier showing subdivision of the PIRO area would also be
17 added to the text as a supplement to Map #7.

18
19 During discussion of the text for "Lower Intensity Uses" to be inserted in place of the
20 language on page 82, the Planning Commission commented that:

- 21 - The existing ES - Expressway services district should be eliminated from the Zoning
22 Ordinance during the next set of revisions;
23 - Many of the highway uses listed in the "Lower Intensity" category were similar to
24 expressway service uses;
25 - Truck stops, auto repair centers, warehouses, and self-storage areas (as typically
26 developed), weren't appealing choices for the high visibility low intensity locations;
27 - Many of the non-intrusive manufacturing operations listed in the M-1 zoning text
28 would be better choices for the low intensity district;
29 - A few good examples of the uses we wanted to attract might be better than a
30 lengthy list; and
31 - Auto repair facilities could be unsightly and shouldn't be encouraged in the lower
32 intensity districts.

33
34 Ms. Eastman commented that language was important. Using words like "publishing
35 house" in place of "print shop" created two entirely different images.
36

37
38 **2) Review of language to be added to the Master Plan Public Utilities Section**

39
40 During discussion of the language to be included in the utilities section (page 62), the
41 Planning Commission noted that:

- 42 - Lake Shannon was not part of any sewer district;
43 - The REU table provided by Tetra Tech should be included in the Appendix;
44 - Urban Services Boundaries (page 63) hadn't been defined in the Master Plan
45 because there were no planned sewer districts at the time the plan was adopted;
46 - Graphics showing the location of current sewer connections were available for
47 inclusion in the Master Plan;
48 - Urban Services District boundaries would have to be set by the Board;
49 - Including sewer connection locations and a general Urban Services District outline
50 as part of the Master Plan would help direct growth to areas with sewers and keep
51 it from areas without sewers;
52

53 Mr. Van Hecke said he would contact the Township's engineer regarding maps or diagrams
54 of the existing sewer district and the proposed extensions for inclusion in the Master Plan.
55
56
57

1 3) Comments regarding the PIRO district text in terms of an overlay, conditional zoning, PUD
2 zoning or rezoning based on the existing Ordinance Districts (M-1, M-2, ROM, OS and ES);
3 to determine underlying uses for the PIRO district based on the existing ordinance
4 language; and consideration of the way the PIRO district development will be implemented.
5

6 During discussion of the Master Plan "PIRO" district text (page 80) and the "Future Land
7 Use Plan" in general, the Planning Commission noted that:
8

- 9 - The eight non-residential development standards (Overall Regulations for Planned
10 Development) beginning on page 80 should be included as part of the introduction
11 to "Future Land Uses" (page 77);
- 12 - The emphasis on PUD development should be removed from all of the planned
13 development land use sections and included in the introductory section as one of
14 the development techniques to be considered for residential and non-residential
15 planned developments;
- 16 - The introduction could also reference conditional or contractual zoning as one of the
17 development techniques;
- 18 - The Future Land Use section should be reviewed to evaluate all references to PUD
19 development throughout the text (pages 77-85);
- 20 - The traditional PUD focus allows mixed uses within a development while a planned
21 unit development would allow for variances to zoning district standards without ZBA
22 review;
- 23 - Parcel sizes and other planned development tools needed to be established in the
24 Zoning Ordinance;
- 25 - The existing Landscape, Architectural, and Access standards might have to be
26 supplemented for the PIRO district; and
- 27 - Specific standards for implementation of the PIRO district will be described in the
28 Zoning Text.
29

30 Mr. Laue arrived from a Township Board Special Meeting at 8:20 p. m.
31

32 In response to comments from Mr. Hartigan, Mr. Fecho presented an estimate for bringing
33 the Census data in the Appendices up to date. He noted that most of the 2000 census data
34 wasn't available at the time the Master Plan was prepared and that section at least should
35 be brought up to date. He didn't feel that the cost would exceed \$1,000 and suggested that
36 Planning Commission ask the Board for approval of that amount. The cost for most of the
37 other material was being handled as part of the ongoing meeting preparation expenses.
38

39 Mr. Hartigan asked if that meant the work being done for the PIRO district was being
40 charged as part of the regular meeting costs. Mr. Fecho ~~said~~ agreed and noted the staff
41 time required for preparing the maps wasn't very much. Most of the Master Plan text work
42 would involve cutting and pasting of text already on file. Mr. Laue suggested that Mr.
43 Hasbrouck write a letter to the Board requesting funds for the Master Plan update.
44

45 Mr. Fecho said that he would provide some zoning text options for discussion at future
46 meetings but he didn't want to begin work on the non-residential ordinance regulations until
47 the Master Plan revisions were completed. Ms. Eastman reminded Mr. Fecho to review the
48 text for the "Planned Service," "Planned Commercial Services," and "Planned Office"
49 sections on page 82, since they were also uses restricted to PUD development.
50

51 **NEW BUSINESS:**
52
53
54
55
56
57

1 **ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS REPORT:**

2
3 Mr. Hartigan reported that the ZBA had permitted variances for a new home on Runyan
4 Lake. The old house was being torn down and the new house would be less non-
5 conforming when completed.

6
7 The ZBA also had approved a temporary sign for Spring Aggregate at Hogan Road and US
8 -23 to direct trucks to the haul route.

9
10
11 **ZONING ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT:**

12
13 **1)** Questions regarding new construction at 9055 Hartland Rd.

14
15 Mr. Hanoute asked about property at the corner of Hartland and White Lake Road where
16 the owner already had an accessory structure and was building another pole barn

17
18 Mr. Van Hecke stated that the property was located at 9055 Hartland Road in the the FR
19 zoning district. The owner, Robert Strong, had ten acres so we didn't regulate the number
20 of outbuildings. Right now he is just parking his own vehicles there. Mr. Strong was told
21 that he couldn't run a commercial business from that location and he would have to get the
22 vehicles out of there if they weren't licensed. Mr. Strong said that they were some of his own
23 vehicles he had been sand blasting so he could restore them.

24
25 **2)** Progress report regarding outdoor storage at the State Baptist Convention Headquarters

26
27 Mr. Hartigan commented that the Baptist Church was still parking trailers outdoors where
28 they were visible from the highway.

29
30 Mr. Van Hecke said that the church officials had been informed of the Township's
31 restrictions on outdoor storage and they had agreed to take care of the problem.

32
33
34 **OTHER BUSINESS FROM MEMBERS:**

35
36 Mr. Hanoute asked what the Planning Commission would be focusing on at our next
37 meeting. He expected to receive some revised Master Plan text and new drawings for
38 review, but thought we would get through that rather quickly.

39
40 Mr. Hanoute asked Mr. Fecho if the Master Plan text revisions and changes in the Census
41 data would constitute our required five year plan review. He suggested that the Planning
42 Commission might want to consider changes to the residential zoning districts while we
43 were doing the others. Mr. Fecho replied that he wanted to get on with the Master Plan and
44 the changes we were making would meet the State update requirements. He didn't believe
45 we had to make any residential changes at this time and didn't want to consider any
46 changes in the residential districts before we have an idea about what the districts might
47 be. The Master Plan would have to be revised again within five years anyway.

48
49 The Planning Commission decided to review the current land division ordinance (#25,
50 adopted 1983) and the residential design standards associated with land use permits as
51 their next project following revisions to the Master Plan and related Zoning Ordinances.
52
53
54
55
56
57

1 **NEXT MEETINGS:**

2
3 April 19, 2005 - Subcommittee Meeting

4
5 April 26, 2005 - Work Session

6
7 May 10, 2005 - Regular Meeting

8
9 **ADJOURNMENT:** 8:45 p. m.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18 _____
19 Laurie Radcliffe, Secretary
20 Tyrone Township Planning Commission

21
22
23
24
25
26 _____
27 Barbara Burtch, Recording Secretary
28 Tyrone Township Planning Commission
29
30
31
32
33
34
35