

1 **TYRONE TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR**
2 **MEETING MINUTES**

3 June 13, 2017 at 7:00 p.m.

4
5 **PRESENT:** Mark Meisel, Cam Gonzalez, Al Pool, Ron Puckett, Dave Wardin, Kurt Schulze,
6 and Bill Wood.

7 **ABSENT:** None.

8 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Tyrone Township Planner Brian Keesey, Tyrone Township
9 Planning/Zoning Administrator Ross Nicholson, and Tyrone Township Planning/Zoning
10 Administrator Assistant Joe Frey

11 **CALL TO ORDER (7:00 PM):** By Chairman Meisel

12
13 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE (7:01 PM):**

14
15 **CALL TO THE PUBLIC (7:02 PM):**

16
17 No comments received.

18
19 **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA (7:05 PM):**
20

21 Kurt Schulze made a motion to approve the agenda as presented. Ron Puckett supported the
22 motion. The motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

23 **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES (7:07 PM):**

24
25 05/16/2017 Meeting and Public Hearing Minutes:

26 On page 2, line 85, “rezoning” was changed to “rezonings”. On page 10, lines 420-422,
27 “considered was” was added to correct a grammatical error.

28 Dave Wardin made a motion to approve the 05/16/2017 regular meeting and public hearing
29 minutes as amended. Al Pool supported the motion. The motion carried by unanimous voice
30 vote.

31 **OLD BUSINESS # 1 (7:10 PM): Open Space Requirements for Residential Districts**

32
33 Chairman Meisel opened the discussion with a summary of the current open space requirements
34 and why revisions to the requirements are being considered in certain single-family zoning
35 districts. He explained the original intended purposes of open space and the most common
36 arguments for and against the requirements.

37
38 Brian Keesey then read through the recommended revisions to the open space requirements for
39 each affected zoning district. In the Farming Residential (FR) and Rural Estate (RE) zoning
40 districts, the minimum lot size would be increased and the open space requirements eliminated.

41 In the Single Family Residential (R-1 and R-2) zoning districts, the minimum lot sizes would
42 also be increased and the open space requirements eliminated.

43
44 Several possible options for updating the Cluster Development Option (CDO) requirements in
45 the R-2 Single Family Residential zoning district were discussed between Brian Keeseey and the
46 Planning Commission. Brian Keeseey recommended requiring the CDO be required in the R-2
47 zoning district for any land division resulting in four or more parcels/lots/units. He mentioned
48 that the number of parcels/lots/units can be discussed further and a different number can be
49 determined if it makes more sense.

50
51 Dave Wardin inquired whether, under the proposed CDO amendments, someone could divide the
52 land into more than four parcels/lots/units that meet or exceed the minimum lot size without
53 needing to use the CDO option. Brian Keeseey responded, stating that any division resulting in
54 four or more parcels/lots/units would require the CDO option in the R-2 zoning district. Further
55 discussion followed.

56
57 The Planning Commission then discussed whether or not it would make sense to rezone one or
58 both of the R-2 zoning districts which are currently under consent judgments. Dave Wardin
59 brought up a few possible problems with rezoning one or both of the properties.

60 Brian Keeseey stated that he would look into the history of the consent judgments to see if they
61 would allow either of the two properties could be rezoned.

62
63 Chairman Meisel summarized what had been discussed thus far. Cam Gonzalez brought up a
64 potential concern with the location of the R-2 zoning district. He explained that allowing lot
65 sizes significantly smaller than some of the surrounding communities could be problematic.
66 Chairman Meisel then brought up the interactive GIS parcel viewer from the Livingston County
67 website to illustrate the transition from densely populated developments to more rural single
68 family parcels. The Planning Commission determined that there should be little to no
69 compatibility issues if the minimum lot size in R-2 is increased. Brian Keeseey mentioned that
70 the future land use plan calls for medium density single family residential in the R-2 zoning
71 district, for which the proposed minimum lots size would comply with.

72
73 The item was closed at 8:25 PM.

74
75 *“Old Business #2: Article 27: Signs – Review for compliance with SCOTUS decision – Content*
76 *neutral” was deferred due to time constraints.*

77
78 **NEW BUSINESS # 1 (8:27 PM): Planning Commission Annual Report to Township Board**

79
80 Chairman Meisel read through a report which listed all the topics, applications, land divisions,
81 boundary realignments, zoning amendments, and other items reviewed by the Planning
82 Commission over the past fiscal year. The Planning Commission briefly discussed several of the
83 topics that should be discussed in the future including consolidated refuse pick-up and road
84 maintenance. Dave Wardin inquired whether or not revisiting the Medical Marijuana ordinance
85 would be worth adding to the list of upcoming topics. Chairman Meisel replied, stating that the
86 Township Board does not feel the topic needs to be revisited at this time, so it was excluded from
87 the list. The Planning Commissioners agreed that the list of past, current, and future topics was
88 thorough and complete.

89
90 Cam Gonzalez made a motion to forward the Planning Commission Annual Report to the
91 Township Board. Dave Wardin supported the motion. The motion carried by unanimous voice
92 vote.

93
94 The item was closed at 8:47 PM.

95
96 **NEW BUSINESS # 2 (8:48 PM): Cemetery Ingress/Egress Requirements**

97
98 Chairman Meisel opened the discussion, stating that an application was recently received for a
99 cemetery special land use which raised a question about the ingress and egress requirements for
100 cemeteries under the current zoning ordinance. He read through the requirements and standards
101 for a cemetery special land use, and pointed out that there was a requirement that a cemetery
102 must have two separate driveways spaced at least two hundred feet apart along the road frontage.
103 He stated that all of the other dimensional requirements could be easily justified, but the
104 driveway design requirement could not. Chairman Meisel brought up the preliminary site plan
105 that was submitted with the application to demonstrate the situation. Due to unique
106 topographical features on the property, only one of the two proposed driveways received sight-
107 distance approval from the Livingston County Road Commission.

108
109 Brian Keeseey suggested a possible solution to the potentially unnecessary driveway standards for
110 a cemetery special land use. He stated that the existing access management portion of the zoning
111 ordinance should be utilized. He continued, stating that separation standards should be
112 determined based on a number of factors including traffic speed, sight distance, traffic volume,
113 and etcetera.

114
115 There was a brief discussion amongst the Planning Commission regarding whether or not two
116 driveways should be required for a cemetery special land use. Most of the Planning Commission
117 was in agreement that one driveway would be sufficient as long as the width of the driveway is
118 adequate for ingress and egress for any events that may take place at the cemetery. Chairman
119 Meisel summarized the discussion and stated that it will be revisited after Planner Brian Keeseey
120 prepares a few recommendations.

121
122 The item was closed at 9:13 PM.

123
124 **NEW BUSINESS # 3 (9:13 PM): Special Land Uses for Seasonal Events in the FR District**

125
126 Zoning Administrator Ross Nicholson opened the discussion with a summary of an inquiry he
127 had received by a resident regarding the possibility of opening a seasonal “haunted forest” in the
128 Farming Residential Zoning District. He suggested that drafting ordinance text to permit
129 seasonal operations such as hay rides, corn mazes, and etcetera may be beneficial to the residents
130 of the township.

131
132 Chairman Meisel explained that the zoning ordinance does not currently permit any such
133 seasonal operations unless they are secondary to a permitted agri-business, home occupation, or
134 commercial/agricultural principle use. He stated that there is an abundance of vacant, non-
135 agricultural property in the township. He continued, suggesting that the Planning Commission

136 hold a discussion on whether or not permitting temporary seasonal operations in the FR district
137 could potentially benefit the community.

138

139 A brief discussion amongst the Planning Commission followed. Topics including time, duration,
140 parking, minimum lot size, limitations on the number of events, signage, and review standards
141 were discussed. All members of the Planning Commission agreed that they would consider
142 approving ordinance text that would permit and regulate temporary seasonal operations in the
143 Farming Residential zoning district. Planner Brian Keesey brought up the fact that these types of
144 operations are already permitted in FR as long as they are associated with an approved agri-
145 business. He stated that the standards and regulations already exist in the ordinance, and if the
146 Planning Commission decides they would like to permit such operations without an agri-
147 business, the text can easily be amended. Chairman Meisel mentioned that the Planning
148 Commission may want to treat these operations separately because there are typically different
149 types of infrastructure and insurance associated with an agri-business versus a residential
150 property owner.

151

152 All Planning Commission members were in agreement to continue discussion on drafting
153 ordinance text to permit and regulate temporary seasonal operations at a later date.

154

155 No action was taken.

156

157 The item was closed at 9:53 PM.

158

159 **NEW BUSINESS # 4 (9:53 PM): Subcommittee/Workshop Meeting Attendance**

160

161 Chairman Meisel opened the discussion, stating that the Planning Commission will be holding an
162 additional meeting each month where topics will be discussed but no actions taken. He
163 explained that the purpose of these meetings would be to expedite the decision-making process
164 during the regular meetings so more agenda items can be covered. He then reviewed the agenda
165 for the first subcommittee/workshop meeting on 06/21/2017, and topics anticipated for future
166 discussion.

167

168 The item was closed at 10:01 PM.

169

170 **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS: NONE**

171 **1) Planning and Zoning Administrator's Report: None**

172 **2) Other Business Items: None**

173 **3) Township Board Actions: None**

174 **4) ZBA Report: None**

175 **5) Future Items: N/A**

176 **6) Correspondence: N/A**

177

178 **ADJOURNMENT (10:02 PM):**