

TYRONE TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

Approved Public Hearing Minutes

Article 22.05.D - Churches and Schools Special Land Use Permit for The Rock (Linden Community Baptist Church)

October 23, 2007

8:00 p. m.

PRESENT: Gary Butler, Robert Byerly, Joe Fumich, Dave Hanoute, Ed Kempisty, Mark Meisel, Laurie Radcliffe

ABSENT:

CALL TO ORDER: 7:30 p.m. by Chairman Hanoute

READING OF THE PUBLIC NOTICE:

The notice was read aloud by Secretary Radcliffe

CORRESPONDENCE:

PURPOSE OF THE HEARING:

The purpose of the hearing was to receive comments regarding an activity center addition to the "The Rock" (Linden Community Baptist Church) and to establish a Special Land Use Permit site plan for the Church property at 1140 Linden Road, Fenton, Michigan as required by Zoning Ordinance Article 22 - Special Land Uses.

Mr. Hanoute observed that the Church is a pre-existing nonconforming use. The hearing is a review of the Special Land Use and the proposed site plan.

COMMENTS FROM THE APPLICANT:

Project Coordinator, **Mike Powell** of Powell and Associates, commented that the Subcommittee had recommended some site plan changes which they would show in the next site drawing.

The Church's proposal was to continue use of the existing one-way drive from Linden Road to Bennett Lake Road. The drive will be expanded around one edge to meet Township parking requirements. The main purpose of the request is to attach an activity center to the south side of the church.

The church and the activity center will not be used simultaneously. Heavy church use occurs during Sunday morning and evening services. The old church building on the site is used as a chapel for church youth activities. The new activity center, as proposed, will have a small warming kitchen for catered events, plus basketball courts and volleyball courts. A handicapped entrance will be provided in the back and there is an existing handicapped entrance and elevator in the front of the main church which will connect with the addition. There is a baseball field east of the church and an existing parsonage located on the south side of the property.

The recommendations from the Planning Commission will determine if the church can go forward with the project or not. Originally it was intended to have a free standing metal activity building located somewhere on the site. Based on the Zoning Ordinance, the most appropriate option was an attachment to the church. The activity building will be attached to the church by a small stick built connector with brick veneer and an asphalt shingle roof.

The steel activity center building will be modified to make it blend with the church. There will be brick and windows on the front facade which will match the existing church exterior. A 3 foot high ribbon of the same brick will wrap around the sides. Steel siding will be used for the addition in a color which will match siding on the church. They plan to use a standing seam steel roof in a gray that will match the church roof. The accessory building roof will be screened on the north side by the existing church. On the south, the accessory building will be screened by the old church, the parsonage, and existing trees. Estimates from the contractor were \$15,000 to \$20,000 more for an asphalt shingle roof compared to a steel roof. The church believes that the additional cost would put project over budget and they would like Planning Commission approval for the metal roof.

There is still some work to be done on the site plan to meet the requirements of the Subcommittee and plans have not been reviewed by the Road Commission or the Drain Commissioner. This is a preliminary plan.

COMMENTS FROM THE PLANNER:

Mr. Hanoute explained to Township Planner John Jackson that some of the landscaping issues were related to the detention pond and the screening on the north side of the parking lot. Mr. Powell mentioned that there was some screening on the north side of the building which would be enhanced. The Township Engineer had told them that the Drain Commissioner would not review the plans until the project received preliminary site plan approval.

Drainage from the church site flows into a grassy swale adjacent to the east side of Linden Road. The intent is to keep the swale dry, but they are aware that it may have to be enlarged because the new building will increase the rate of runoff into the swale. The Drain Commissioner may want them to back up some of the runoff. Right now there is unrestricted runoff through a culvert under Linden Road. We may have to stop some of the water and provide temporary storage after an initial rain. The Subcommittee requested landscaping to improve the appearance of the swale once the detention area is determined.

Mr. Jackson asked Mr. Powell to provide the information used for parking lot calculation. Mr. Hanoute commented that the calculations were based on the church pews, but there was no documentation of the pew sizes and numbers. Mr. Jackson asked if the activity center parking was included in the calculation. Powell replied that the two facilities wouldn't be used at the same time. Mr. Hanoute thought the final parking calculation should be based on the highest occupancy load. Calculations should be shown for the church and the accessory building.

Mr. Jackson commented that a metal roof would be more durable than a shingle roof, but he asked the Planning Commission what the Township has done in the past, since it was not typical residential material.

COMMENTS FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Mr. Kempisty asked why the parking was described as anticipated parking. Pastor Easlick said the parking shown on the plan more than meets the current requirements, but they don't know what they might need in ten years. If the congregation grows, they would have to come back to request additional parking. The parking that is shown on the drawing is more than they have right now.

Responding to a question from Mr. Meisel, Pastor Easlick said the church had been roofed within the last three to five years. Mr. Meisel asked about the proposed standing seam metal roof for the activity center. He asked if that could mandate a standing seam roof for the church the next time the roofing was replaced. He supported low maintenance roofing and wondered why it couldn't be used on the church to avoid the problem of two connected buildings with vastly dissimilar roofs. He asked them to consider a transition plan for the church roof when the church shingles had to be replaced.

Mr. Fumich asked them to match the color of the roof to the color of the shingles. Mr. Powell said they planned to do that, but a metal roof for the church had never entered his mind. Mr. Meisel reminded him that a metal roof would solve their roofing problem for 50 years instead of the usual 10 to 15 years for asphalt shingles.

Mr. Hanoute recalled that they had agreed to consider horizontal metal siding in place of the vertical siding shown on the church elevation. Their site plans also show split faced block rather than the brick Mr. Powell mentioned. That would create another set of dissimilar materials as opposed to brick and horizontal siding. Continuity of materials is one way to improve aesthetics. He supported the benefits of metal roofing, especially if there is a plan to transition to a metal roof for the church. Because the span is smaller, the church roof wouldn't have to be the same quality as the activity center roof. If the church would commit to using metal roofing on the church in the future, he could accept metal for the activity center.

Pastor Bob Easlick responded that there would be no problem with a commitment for using metal roofing for the church. Builders are even using steel roofs on homes. It would probably be more cost effective to go that route when the time comes to re-roof the church. That way the whole project would look the same. The church has been re-roofed twice in the last ten years and with a metal roof it probably would only have to be done every fifty years. It makes more sense to have the whole thing metal and save money from the shingles to put it into the community.

Ms. Radcliffe asked what the plans were for the door into the church that would be located just north of the activity center. Mr. Powell said that they planned to follow the Subcommittee recommendations for landscaping and separation from the parking area. Since snow and ice fly off of metal roofing, she wanted to know if the parking areas were located far enough away from the building to avoid damage. Mr. Powell replied that snow tabs would included with the roof and no activities were planned for areas where water or ice would come off of the roof.

Ms. Radcliffe noted that the drive coming out on Bennett Lake Road is dangerously close to a big intersection. She asked if the Road Commission had reviewed the driveway location. Mr. Powell said the driveway was an existing condition so they wouldn't be going to the Road Commission. Mr. Hanoute said that might be something the Subcommittee would ask them to do for the final site plan.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Dave Gallinat, 9006 Apple Orchard, said he lived next to the church's Linden Road detention area. Water flows from Lobdell Road down Linden Road into the detention area. The drainage ditch north of the church property doesn't have much water in it, but the run off from Linden Road accumulates there and some runs into the church pond. The church detention pond drains into the wetland on the other side of Linden Road. The wetland fills up really quick and the water just stands there. When the wetland fills up, his sump pump runs constantly, usually at 30 minute intervals, for a week or two until the water level drops. The neighbor next to the wetland on the other side of Linden Road needs to have 3 sump pumps for his property. If there is water standing in the wetland, his basement fills with water.

There is no outlet for the wetland on the west side of Linden Road, so the water doesn't leave it very fast. Increasing the water level in the wetland will wreak havoc on the neighbors. He asked the Planning Commission to consider the drainage difficulties and not make the drainage problem worse than it already is. The church is a good neighbor, but there is a water problem. If the church isn't careful, it would add to the problem we already have. One day, when his sump pump quit working, the basement filled with six inches of water within a few hours. Increasing the detention area could harm the neighbor's basements as well as his basement. There is a real problem with water storage and drainage.

Mr. Hanoute observed that there is a high water table in the area. The Church's impervious surface increase for drives and parking might not increase the amount of runoff but it will get to the detention area sooner. That problem will be addressed when we get the engineers recommendations for the final review.

Mr. Gallinat said he wasn't opposed to the activity center or the building aesthetics. He just wanted the Planning Commission to be aware of the problems. Mr. Powell said that the state of Michigan drainage laws do not allow flowing water to be stopped or blocked and diverted to another property. We have to accept all the water coming in and then deal with the drainage.

Mr. Gallinat's concern was that the area wouldn't be able to absorb water being added from the church property and it will raise the water table. The drainage structure running behind his house just north of the church property has only been full once in eight years. It collects drainage from Whitacker Road and Apple Orchard and brings it down the Linden Road ditch to the church retention area on the east side of Linden Road, the road where the water sits until it can move across into the wetlands on the west side of Linden Road.

Mr. Hanoute explained that the Planning Commission would not make a recommendation on the request tonight. They would take time to consider the information provided at the hearing. This hearing was for the Special Land Use which will permit an addition to the church rather than a final site plan approval. The details of the addition will still have to be addressed by the Planning Commission and other agencies before a final site plan can be approved.

Mr. Powell commented that the hearing also provided information for the church to determine whether they can afford to continue with the project. From this hearing, it sounds like the Township is willing to work with church and they will probably go ahead.

Mr. Hanoute told "The Rock" representatives that the Planning Commission would make a recommendation regarding the request at the November 13, 2007 meeting.

CLOSING PLANNING COMMISSION REMARKS:

There being no additional comment, the hearing was closed at 8:05 p.m.



Laurie Radcliffe, Secretary
Tyrone Township Planning Commission



Barbara Burtch, Recording Secretary
Tyrone Township Planning Commission