

TYRONE TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

PUBLIC HEARING MEETING MINUTES NOVEMBER 8, 2011

PRESENT: Present: David Hanoute, Steve Hasbrouck, Mark Meisel, Ed Kempisty, Deb Lee, Brandon Peabody, and Mike Wood.

OTHERS: Tyrone Township Planner, Sally Hodges

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

READING OF THE PUBLIC NOTICE

The Planning Commission secretary read aloud the public notice for tonight's meeting, which was published in the October 23, 2011, edition of the **TRI-COUNTY TIMES** and was posted at the Tyrone Township Hall on October 18, 2011, at 9:00 A.M.

The purpose of this Public Hearing was to receive comments regarding proposed revisions to the following Zoning Ordinance 36 sections:

Accessory Buildings – revisions to allow for conditional approval of accessory buildings up to 1,200 square feet - Section 2.01 Definitions, Article 20 Schedule of Regulations Table and Section 20.02 Footnote O, and Section 21.02 Accessory Structures Provisions.

Public Comment:

Mike Cunningham, 6260 Bullard, questioned if a full site plan review by the Planning Commission is needed for a 1,200 square foot structure and questioned if increasing an existing structure to 1,200 square feet would need an additional review by the Planning Commission.

Paul Phelps, 9009 Apple Orchard, questioned if a full site plan review by the Planning Commission is needed to increase his 800 square foot structure to a 1,200 square foot structure.

Planning Commission and Planner Response:

- increasing an existing structure to a 1,200 square foot structure would go through the same review process as building a new 1,200 square foot structure;
- any accessory structure above 800 square feet would require a review by the Planning Commission, whether adding on to an existing structure or building a new structure;
- up to an 800 square foot structure is permitted under the current Zoning Ordinance;
- in Mr. Phelps case, he would have to meet a lesser set of standards that are similar to the home occupation review and it will require a public hearing (he has been to the ZBA for a variance to allow a 1,200 square foot accessory structure).

Kennels - to amend the standards for Dog Kennels and the keeping of pets - Section 2.01 Definitions, Section 21.49 Keeping of Pets, and Section 22.05.G Dog Kennels.

Public Comment:

Kelly Meade, 6260 Bullard, disagreed with limiting the number of animals (dogs) and how the PC came up with its numbers; seems like we are cutting down on the number of

animals allowed compared to the surrounding areas; the rural area should have more leniency in the number of dogs allowed; questioned allowing only 2 dogs on 2 acres; she suggested doubling the number of dogs allowed; should not punish responsible dog owners because of irresponsible dog owners.

Scott Dietrich, 13505 White Lake Road, stated there are a lot of irresponsible people who own dogs and these regulations are brought on by them and stated a number needs to be put on it or there would be too many animals in the area.

Bethany Hammond, 9349 Mabley Hill, suggested breaking down the categories (0 to 1 acre, 1-2 acres, 2-3 acres, 3-4 acres, etc.), she stated she is not saying to allow more than 6 dogs on 10 acres, but dividing it up a little more could allow a few more dogs on the larger lots.

Planning Commission and Planner Response:

- the surrounding communities were surveyed and a comparison was done; almost every area defines a kennel differently; they are broken down into different categories, so you cannot do an apples to apples comparison; the Commission debated back and forth on the number of animals and arrived at the proposed number of dogs per acre, which is similar to that allowed by surrounding communities;
- a challenge was how do you reasonably keep control of neighborhoods so you do not have 60 dogs in a small neighborhood versus allowing people with large acreage to have multiple dogs as pets;
- a big concern is neighborhoods of a ¼ acre up to 2 acre lots and looking at how they are configured with homes being close together and you are trying to minimize the potential conflict that occurs with having too many dogs in a too confined of an area versus providing leniency for people who want more pets in the rural areas;
- the Planning Commission will look at the lot area requirements, look at the maximum number of dogs allowed, and look at adding conditions for responsibility.

Parking Spaces - to increase the size of parking spaces, require double-striping and allow pavement alternatives - Section 25.02 Off Street Parking Space Layout, Standards, Construction and Maintenance, and Figure 12 and Figure 12a.

Public Comment:

Bill Wood, 9485 Center Road, asked if he would be affected by these changes, since he is in the process of upgrading his property, already came in to the Planning Commission subcommittee meeting and new plans are being drawn by his architect as the outcome from the subcommittee meeting.

Scott Dietrich, 13505 White Lake Road, questioned the sizes of the parking spaces.

Planning Commission and Planner Response:

- Mr. Wood would fall under the current Ordinance, since he already applied to the PC;
- the parking spaces are being made wider than the current size.

Sign Regulations – to amend the regulations for changeable copy signs, increase sign sizes and specify signs permitted in the new PIRO and PCS districts - Article 27 Outdoor Advertising and Sign Regulations.

Public Comment:

None

Primary Roads – Add definition for Primary Road - Section 2.01 Definitions – Street.

Public Comment:

Don Peitz, 13520 White Lake Road, requested that the speed limit on White Lake Road, between Bennett Lake Road and the Township boundary to the east, be reduce to 35 miles per hour.

Scott Dietrich, 13505 White Lake Road, agreed with Mr. Peitz; he stated that the noise from large trucks is a problem, need to slow the traffic down.

Planning Commission and Planner Response:

- the Livingston County Road Commission designates speed limits;
- suggested petitioning the LCRC and ask for a study to be done under their jurisdiction.

PIRO District – Add Planned Industrial, Research Office zoning district - Article 16A.

Public Comment:

Don Peitz, 13520 White Lake Road, stated uses (page 6) should be changed regarding lumber yards, should not be in general industry, but maybe should be under special land use; regarding wood containers, not being allowed in light industrial, but should be allowed on a special case or be permitted period.

Mike Cunningham, 6260 Bullard, questioned if green space buffers are in here; suggested the Planning Commission reconsider the open space requirements within the PIRO district.

Planning Commission and Planner Response:

- Planning Commission can look at, and possibly redefine, what constitutes open space.

PIRO, PCS and PUD Reference Amendments – add references to PIRO and PCS districts and the PUD designation - Section 3.00 District Designations; Section 8.02 Cluster Development Option; Section 20.01 Table of Schedule of Regulations Dimensional Requirements; Section 20.03 Table of Land Uses by Zoning District; Section 21.16 Noise; Section 21.32 Wireless Communications Facilities subsection 21.32.C.2; Section 21.42 State Licensed Child and Adult Care Facilities Table 21.1; Section 21.45 Prohibited Uses; Section 23.01 Developments and Uses Requiring Site Plan Review; Section 23.18 Architectural Standards subsections 23.18.C Roof Appurtenances and subsection 23.18.N Use Groups; Section 30.05 Plans and subsection 30.05.B.2 Site Plans.

Public Comment:

None

MHP Manufactured Home Park District – typo correction – Section 10.03.H.

Public Comment:

None

Condominium Development Standards – typo correction and restructuring of section – Section 21.43.G.

Public Comment:

November 8, 2011 - Approved Tyrone Township Planning Commission Public Hearing Meeting Minutes

None

FR/RE Districts - Article 4 and **Special Land Uses** -- Article 22.05.S(new) to permit limited commercial storage in the FR/RE districts.

Public Comment:

Tom Hicks, 10231 Carmer Road, questioned what the accessory building size would be considering it can only be 5% of the maximum coverage;

(unknown), questioned this Zoning Ordinance versus the 1,200 square foot accessory building Ordinance discussed earlier;

Steve McGorisk, Hartland Road, questioned if a special land use permit is needed with a full site plan or would this just go before the Planning Commission to be approved.

Planning Commission and Planner Response:

- proposed limiting the maximum size of the accessory building or accessory buildings not to exceed 5% of the maximum lot coverage;
- proposed a 3 acre minimum instead of the proposed 10 acre minimum;
- on a 20 acre lot, the accessory building could be 10,890 square feet, on a 10 acre parcel the accessory building could be 5,445 square feet, and on a 3 acre parcel it would allow a 1,633 square foot accessory structure;
- the 1,200 square foot accessory structure discussed earlier was a separate issue which was a general provision that applies to everyone;
- this Ordinance applies to FR/RE Zoning Districts only;
- a person would have to follow the process for being approved as a home occupation which is a modified site plan followed by a public hearing.

The Planning Commission will review the public comments and Planning Commission comments at the next Planning Commission meeting on December 12, 2011, revisions will be made to the amendments and then they will be sent to the Township Board with recommendation for adoption..

The proposed Zoning ordinance amendments will be placed on the township's website.

ADJOURNMENT: The public hearing was closed at 8:30 pm.

Lorie Thielen, Recording Secretary
Tyrone Township Planning Commission