

# TYRONE TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

## APPROVED MEETING MINUTES

July 13, 2010

**PRESENT:** Dave Hanoute, Steve Hasbrouck, Ed Kempisty, Deb Lee, Mark Meisel, Brandon Peabody, Laurie Radcliffe

**ABSENT:**

**CALL TO ORDER:** 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Hanoute

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:**

Chairman Hanoute welcomed Deb Lee and Brandon Peabody and congratulated them on their appointment to the Planning Commission.

**CALL TO THE PUBLIC:**

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:**

Moved by Kempisty, seconded by Hasbrouck, to review New Business Item 1 before Old Business and to add establishment of a Public Hearing date for review of the PIRO Ordinance to the Agenda as New Business Item 3. The motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:**

1) June 8, 2010 - Regular Meeting Minutes

Moved by Meisel, seconded by Hasbrouck, to approve the June 8, 2010 minutes as presented. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

**CORRESPONDENCE:**

**SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT:**

**NEW BUSINESS:**

1) Request of the Baptist State Convention of Michigan for an amended Special Land Use Site Plan to construct a second accessory building at 8420 Runyan Lake Road, RE parcel 21-100-003

Mr. Hanoute explained that the State Convention headquarters location was previously approved as a Special Land Use. Their request is to add a second garage. The site is zoned FR and is over 2 acres in size, so the number of accessory buildings is not restricted.

Mike Collins, Executive Director of the Baptist State Convention told the Planning Commission that their church has received new disaster relief equipment and they need

a place to store it. There are four hundred and five members of their denomination located throughout the state who are called out for emergencies in cooperation with the Red Cross and Salvation Army. The workers are sent directly to the disaster site and are limited to 4 days of service. The emergency equipment is driven to the disaster site separately. The new building will be serviced by electricity, but water will not be provided because the accessory building will be used for storage only. The shingles and siding will match the material used on their headquarters building. Much of their building construction is done by volunteer labor and they would like to begin construction in August while their builders are available. If a semi hauler is needed for a temporary pick-up or delivery, there is room to park it on the driveway at the back of the site. Their black top wasn't built to support frequent heavy vehicle storage or parking.

During review of the site plan (6/10/10 rev.), the Planning Commission commented that:

- The new dumpster location was not clearly labeled on the site drawing;
- The existing site layout was shown on the aerial drawing;
- Relocating the dumpster to the north side of the existing garage would eliminate at least one parking space;
- A detail should be added to the drawing showing the size of the dumpster enclosure, the height and type of enclosure walls, and the type of gate(s);
- The west side garage door is intended to act as a pull through access and to provide additional light,
- Their new disaster equipment consists of a cooking unit, a chain saw unit, a water purification unit, a small trailer for clothes and personal equipment, and a van to pull it;
- The disaster equipment is trailer mounted;
- A walkway and stoop should be added to service the pedestrian access on the east side of the building;
- The height of the building to the ridge line should be shown on the drawing;
- Grass pavers or other hard surface material should be used to access the west garage door if they do not want to connect it to the driveway with paving; and
- Additional landscaping is not required.

Moved by Kempisity, seconded by Radcliffe, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Special Land Use Permit Site Plan amendment after the following site plan conditions have been provided: 1) a trash dumpster drawing detail showing the dimensions of the enclosure, the distance from the accessory buildings, and the type of gates, 2) location of a ridgepole building height dimension on the site drawing; 3) elimination of the overhead door on the east side of the new accessory building from the site drawing; 4) inclusion of the east side service door paving and stoop location on the site plan, 5) inclusion of the location and type of hard surface access to the overhead west side door; and 6) a note on the drawing that the dumpster has been relocated. The motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Collins was informed that the Township Board would have to receive the material by noon on July 28th for the Township Board's August 5th meeting. The Planning Commission should receive the material by July 22nd for review before forwarding the plans to the Board.

## **OLD BUSINESS:**

### **1) Review of the Planning Commission's Application Process information and Fee Schedule**

During review of the Planning Commission Application Form, the Planning Commission discussed:

- Basing review time estimates on complete applications only;
- Submitting applications to the Recording Secretary only;
- Locating the tax status information at the bottom of the Application page;
- Reserving a portion of the application for Township use;
- Inclusion of parcel zoning classifications with the tax code;
- References to "township representatives" in connection with site inspections;
- Establishing a review fee for Home Occupations;
- Inclusion of PUDs as a separate review category;
- Alerting residents to the need for home occupation permits via the Township Newsletter;
- Whether to require application fees, punitive fines, or renewal fees for home occupations;
- Revising the request section to correspond to the fee schedule classification and,
- Referencing boundary realignments with land divisions in the fee schedule and application requirements.

During review of the Planning Commission Application Chart, the Planning Commission discussed;

- Authorizing the Recording Secretary and Planning Commission Chairman to make determinations regarding concept reviews;
- Locating Public Hearings Including public hearings following the Planning Commission meeting on the review chart;
- Applicants who do not want to follow the Ordinance site plan review process and information requirements;
- Inclusion of a statement that plans will not be reviewed until complete information has been received;
- Requiring less detail for concept reviews than for Subcommittee and Planning Commission meetings;
- Using Subcommittee Meetings to concentrate on specific plan details that should be included or corrected before Planning Commission review;
- Allowing more than one Planning Commission meeting for complex plans;
- Allowing more than 10 or 15 minutes to accomplish site plan reviews;
- Requiring the applicant to review their compliance with the appropriate checklist when they submit their projects;
- How to get some applicants to submit a complete application in the first place;
- How to insure that some applicants understand the required revisions in the second place;
- How to insure that applicants stick with the process until it is complete;
- Using a flow as a visual example of the review process complexity;
- Inclusion of subcommittee meeting entry in addition to the concept and staff review; and

- Development of separate process check lists for some of the more complicated zoning district requirements.

Mr. Hanoute commented that it was hard to be specific about what applicants wanted to do if they weren't even sure themselves. That would be the function of a concept review. There are some requirements that are basic to any request, but others might be developed during preliminary discussions. It is difficult to provide a single process that will encompass 14 different categories and as many different subcategories that might develop during the course of a concept discussion or site plan review.

Some applicants won't know what needs to be submitted until there is some sort of pre-application review. That can be a staff review for a simple project or a concept review for more complex applications. If consultant or agency reviews are needed, those should be completed before the Planning Commission review. Mr. Hanoute said he would redraw the flow chart to allow for a concept review or staff review before the application is submitted to the Planning Commission.

Township Clerk Kremer, speaking from the floor, said there should be something to show applicants who think they can bypass the process and start hounding board members. They should have some idea that they have to do certain things, and if they don't do them, they can holler all they want. If we communicate well, then we can eliminate problems. If there are hearings and other things involved, it may take 5 or 6 months, no matter what. What gets people aggravated is to come in and be told it can be done in 60 days and they are still waiting after 6 months. Planning Commission members commented that they would never offer a time estimate without seeing the plans. Delays are usually the result of asking for information and then waiting to receive it, or making changes in the middle of the review process.

Clerk Kremer thought there should be someone with authority to tell applicants if their drawings are complete or incomplete when they come in. Planning Commission members commented that many people try to be helpful, but don't provide realistic expectations. Sometimes, the information provided meets some of the application requirements, but not all. Sometimes, Board members ask to have the material forwarded whether it is completed correctly or not. Sometimes professionals require pay for services rendered before continuing with a project. Mr. Meisel recommended contacting the Planning Commission Chairman or Vice-Chairman before requesting material for Board review. Clerk Kremer said the material should be forwarded when requested, but what hadn't been done should be pointed out. He was informed that the list of what needed to be done was included in the minutes of any discussion of the request, or any motion to table or approve with conditions or deny and was included with any material forwarded to the Board. Mr. Kremer asked to have the information forwarded as a list showing what had been done and what had not been done.

Mr. Hanoute asked the Recording Secretary to continue revision of the process outline to accompany the flow chart and forward it to him prior to distributing the flow chart for review at the next meeting.

Mr. Hanoute asked Clerk Kremer if the Board would be able to review the Fee Schedule without the process information he requested. Mr. Kremer said it was important to have the process information so the Township could determine what would cost them money.

Mr. Hanoute said Township Planner Sally Hodges had provided a memo describing how the fees were determined. Mr. Meisel said we estimated the number of hours or meetings it would take to finalize a request and prorated the Planning Commission costs over the estimated number of hours and then compared the costs with those of other townships. We can deal with the process information, but there is a lot of background associated with the costs.

Mr. Hanoute said that if the Board preferred the Planning Commission would wait until the process information was finalized. Clerk Kremer suggested that Mr. Hanoute go over the process with him and Supervisor Miles in order to get something out there.

During their review of the Fee Schedule, Planning Commission members commented that Page 3, Site Condominium Subdivision, indicated that Engineer and Planner Fees were not applicable for Subcommittee Meetings and asked to have the consultant's entry reference an hourly fee "if requested" or "if required" for most of the site plan review categories and the open space relocation referenced on Page 4. Ms. Hodges said she would review the fee schedule again and make the revisions. The Planning Commission determined that that open space relocation associated with a site plan review would not be treated as a separate expense, but would be treated as a land division for the purposes of establishing a fee for review and any public hearing fees associated with the type of relocation.

Mr. Hanoute asked to have the revised flow chart, the application, the process outline and the fee schedule ready for review at the next meeting although he would prefer to have another month to prepare the material before discussing it with the Board. He suggested a joint Planning Commission and Township Board meeting on August 10, 2010 in order to involve all of the Planning Commission and Board members in a discussion of processing and fees.

2) Review of the Planning Commission's list of future projects

Mr. Hanoute asked the Planning Commission for suggestions to prioritize the projects currently waiting Planning Commission review together with recommendations for new topics.

Planning Commission members agreed to forward copies of the Planning Commission's action list for review and comment by the Township Board members at the joint meeting in addition to review of the fee schedule and processing information.

3) Planned Industrial, Research and Office (PIRO) Public Hearing

The Planning Commission was informed that the proposed PIRO text had been forwarded to the Livingston County Planning Department for a courtesy review. Ms. Hodges said she would make the text revisions discussed at a previous meeting for review at the August 10, 2010 meeting.

Because the Planning Commission only meets once a month, Mr. Hasbrouck thought the Planning Commission had discussed the PIRO revisions well enough to review the revisions at the same time the text was being discussed at the Public Hearing.

Chairman Hanoute instructed the Recording Secretary to schedule a Public Hearing for August 10, 2010 to review the PIRO Zoning text, and to add a recommendation regarding the PIRO text, a review of the fee schedule and processing documents, and a discussion of the future action list to the August 10, 2010 Agenda.

**OTHER BUSINESS FROM MEMBERS:**

**ZONING ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT:**

**ZBA REPORT:**

**TOWNSHIP BOARD REPORT:**

Mr. Hasbrouck reminded the Planning Commission that the August Primary election was very important because of the funding for Fire and Police Protection in addition to the County EMS renewal.

Mr. Kremer said that a meeting was scheduled for July 28th at the Tyrone Covenant Presbyterian Church to discuss the public safety issue.

**ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 by Chairman Hanoute.

**FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:**

**NEXT MEETINGS:**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Laurie Radcliffe, Secretary  
Tyrone Township Planning Commission

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Barbara Burtch, Recording Secretary  
Tyrone Township Planning Commission