

1                   **TYRONE TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR**  
2                   **MEETING MINUTES**  
3                   **March 21, 2018 -7:00 p.m.**  
4

5   **PRESENT:** Mark Meisel, Dave Wardin, Cam Gonzalez, and Kurt Schulze

6   **ABSENT:** Ron Puckett, Al Pool, and Bill Wood.

7   **OTHERS PRESENT:** Tyrone Township Planner Brian Keeseey and Tyrone Township Planning  
8   & Zoning Administrator Ross Nicholson.

9   **CALL TO ORDER (7:00 pm):** By Chairman Meisel.

10  
11   **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE (7:00 pm):**

12  
13   **CALL TO THE PUBLIC (7:01 pm):** No comments were received.

14  
15   **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA (7:01 pm):**

16  
17   Cam Gonzalez made a motion to approve the agenda as presented. Dave Wardin supported the  
18   motion. The motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

19  
20   **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES (7:01 pm):** Deferred to the April 10, 2018 meeting

21  
22   **OLD BUSINESS # 1 (7:02 pm): Vale Royal Site Plan and Special Land Use Amendment**

23  
24   Chairman Meisel brought up the documents relevant to the application on the overhead display  
25   monitors and thanked the applicant for attending the meeting. He summarized where the  
26   Planning Commission had left off on discussion of the application during the previous meeting  
27   and public hearing (03/13/2018). He suggested that Brian Keeseey start the discussion by reading  
28   from the review letter he had prepared for the application.

29  
30   Brian Keeseey stated that there were just a few details that needed to be worked through before  
31   the minor site plan and special land use amendment could be recommended for approval. He  
32   stated that he has received updated materials from the applicant since the previous meeting and  
33   noted that most of the requirements have been fulfilled. He suggested that the maximum  
34   occupancy should be discussed since the number indicated on the site plan does not match up  
35   with the use statement. Chairman Meisel stated that they will need all documents related to the  
36   special land use to be consistent. He stated that the total occupancy approved by the Fire Chief  
37   after installation, inspection, and approval of the fire suppression system is one hundred and  
38   sixty-three (163), which includes one hundred and fifty (150) guests and thirteen (13) workers  
39   (caterers, DJ, bartender, etc.). He suggested the total capacity listed in the use statement should  
40   be changed from one hundred and sixty (160) (including one hundred and fifty (150) guests  
41   inside the barn, ten (10) workers inside the barn, and four (4) valet workers outside the barn) to  
42   one hundred and sixty-three (163) total so it matches the letter from the Fire Chief. He suggested  
43   that having capacities listed in multiple places throughout the use statement, as well as stating the

44 number of workers that would not be inside the barn, would likely lead to unnecessary  
45 confusion.

46  
47 The Planning Commission briefly discussed whether or not it would be necessary to include a  
48 statement of the total site capacity or just the barn. It was determined that the barn occupancy  
49 should be stated clearly and consistently at one hundred and sixty-three (163) following  
50 installation, inspection, and approval of the fire suppression system, in accordance with the  
51 recommendation from the Fire Chief. The total site occupancy would be limited by the total  
52 number of available parking spaces. Chairman Meisel and Dave Wardin suggested that the  
53 breakdown of workers on site (explaining the total number of caterers, valets, etc..) would not be  
54 necessary. Kurt Schulze asked the applicant what would happen if a wedding party wanted to  
55 use a string quartet in lieu of a DJ. Valerie Johnson replied, explaining that her contracts  
56 indicate that the number of workers would be included in the maximum occupancy limit, so they  
57 would need to make arrangements accordingly so the total barn occupancy does not exceed one  
58 hundred and sixty-three (163) people. Kurt Schulze clarified, stating that he wanted to know if it  
59 would be a possibility to choose alternative entertainment instead of being limited to only a DJ or  
60 no music at all. Valerie Johnson explained that it would be up to the wedding party to determine  
61 which form of entertainment they would like and ensure the maximum occupancy limit is  
62 adhered to.

63  
64 Brian Keeseey continued through the review letter. He stated that another unresolved issue is the  
65 driveway approach improvements, as required by the Livingston County Road Commission  
66 (LCRC). He stated that he knows it was briefly discussed previously but wasn't certain where  
67 exactly the discussion had left off. Dave Wardin stated that the approach improvements have not  
68 yet been completed but could potentially be worked into the special land use and site plan  
69 amendment recommendation as a condition for approval. He suggested allowing the applicant a  
70 specified amount of time to complete the driveway approach improvements, such as six (6)  
71 months. Dave Wardin stated, to clarify, that the culvert work on the driveway approach has been  
72 completed, but it has still not been paved. Brian Keeseey asked the applicant if she had received  
73 the necessary permits for performing work in the Livingston County Road right-of-way. Valerie  
74 Johnson stated that her contractor had likely pulled a permit for the initial culvert work.  
75 Chairman Meisel stated that the original permit is likely expired at this point and recommended  
76 verifying that all necessary permits have been issued and are valid prior to performing the paving  
77 of the approach.

78  
79 Brian Keeseey stated that all other items in the review have been addressed. Chairman Meisel  
80 brought up the use statement again to verify that all necessary information is included. He  
81 suggested that the language in the use statement referring to the temporary probationary period  
82 where the applicant will be required to submit event logs on a monthly basis should be revised.  
83 He suggested changing the statement specifying the monthly basis to specifying the logs to be  
84 required on a regular basis as determined by Tyrone Township. Valerie Johnson asked if the  
85 event logs should be provided within a specified time period following each month during the  
86 probationary period. Chairman Meisel suggested that they should be submitted as quickly as  
87 possible following each month, but they may determine a specified time period, such as seven  
88 (7) to ten (10) days following each month. He stated that the purpose of the monthly logs is to

89 demonstrate to the Township that the operation is compliant and cooperative. He stated that after  
90 the probationary period, if no issues arise, the event logs would revert back to an annual basis.

91

92 Chairman Meisel brought up a portion of the use statement that indicates the barn has a low “fuel  
93 load”. He stated that the barn itself is considered the “fuel load” and the statement, as written, is  
94 not accurate. He stated that the fact that candles and smoking are prohibited in the barn would  
95 not lessen the “fuel load” but would reduce the chances that the “fuel load” would be ignited. He  
96 recommended removing the reference to “fuel load” as it would be irrelevant once the fire  
97 suppression system is installed, inspected, and approved with the maximum barn capacity set at  
98 one hundred and sixty-three (163) people. Valerie Johnson asked if she could be allowed to use  
99 candles for events. She stated that frequently receives requests to use candles for events and has  
100 had to deny the requests in the past. Brian Keesey stated that the use of candles falls outside of  
101 the Planning Commission’s control. Chairman Meisel stated that they would need to rely on the  
102 Fire Chief’s recommendation to make that determination. Dave Wardin asked the Planning  
103 Commission if they should include a statement indicating that the use of candles, cooking, and  
104 smoking is prohibited without approval from the Fire Department having jurisdiction. Chairman  
105 Meisel indicated that he believed Dave Wardin’s suggested statement to be appropriate.

106

107 Chairman Meisel continued to read through the use statement. He made note of a portion of the  
108 use statement indicating that when the barn is used for private events including dinner parties,  
109 family parties, holiday parties, home retail parties, garage sales, or similar events, they would be  
110 exempt from the requirements for public events including parking attendants, time limitations,  
111 etc., and would be included on the event logs as private events. Chairman Meisel stated that it is  
112 a good idea to include the private events on the event logs even though they do not fall under the  
113 same requirements as public events since it would keep the Township informed of all times when  
114 events are occurring. He continued, stating that if someone reported an event to the Township,  
115 there would be accurate information available indicating the time and nature of the events.

116

117 Dave Wardin requested clarification on the proposed number of small events per week.  
118 Chairman Meisel and Kurt Schulze confirmed that five (5) small events per week are being  
119 requested. Chairman Meisel stated that making a decision on an appropriate number of small  
120 events per week should be based on the intensity of use factor. He stated that his understanding  
121 is that there have never been any complaints on the venue submitted to the Township. He  
122 continued, stating that, in his opinion, based on the history of the operation, the location of the  
123 site is close to ideal. He continued, explaining that he has never noticed any traffic issues during  
124 large events and, therefore, he believes that allowing five (5) or six small events per week within  
125 the hours of two (2) to five (5) pm should not create any significant nuisance factors. He asked  
126 the Planning Commission what their opinions were on permitting five (5) small events per week.  
127 Dave Wardin stated that he believes that the proposed timeframe for small events is sensible  
128 since the large events, such as weddings, would take place during Fridays and Saturdays, leaving  
129 the remaining five (5) days open. Valerie Johnson inquired about the possibility of holding large  
130 events on the day before or the day of holidays in instances where they do not fall on Fridays or  
131 Saturdays. Chairman Meisel replied that it is an interesting question since most holidays,  
132 excluding Labor Day and Memorial Day, will vary from year-to-year. He stated that he would  
133 personally not have an issue with considering the possibility of allowing large events during  
134 holidays. Brian Keesey stated that he believes it could be possible to allow large holiday events

135 in certain instances. He suggested that if the Planning Commission is interested in permitting  
136 large holiday events outside of the permitted timeframe for large events, they should consider  
137 allowing the Zoning Administrator some administrative discretion to determine whether or not  
138 any proposed special events would be appropriate on a case-by-case basis. He continued, stating  
139 that it would provide more flexibility for the applicant since she would not need to come before  
140 the Planning Commission every time a large holiday event is proposed. Chairman Meisel  
141 indicated that he was agreeable with Brian Keeseey's suggestion. He proposed language in the  
142 use statement indicating that in instances where holidays fall on the day before or after the  
143 weekend, a waiver may be applied for to modify start and end days as long as the event occurs  
144 over the contiguous holiday and weekend. Chairman Meisel asked the Planning Commission if  
145 the proposed language made sense to everyone or if they had any suggestions for alternate  
146 wording. Dave Wardin asked if, with the proposed language, it could potentially allow for a four  
147 (4) day wedding. Chairman Meisel indicated that, per Brian Keeseey's suggestion, the large  
148 events would still be limited to two (2) days. Brian Keeseey suggested some minor revisions to  
149 the wording of the statement. Chairman Meisel asked the Planning Commission if they felt that  
150 three (3) day large events may be appropriate under certain circumstances. Dave Wardin asked  
151 Valerie Johnson her opinion. She indicated that she does not typically receive requests for three  
152 (3) day large events, however, she feels there is a good chance that she will receive the request at  
153 some point in the future. Chairman Meisel suggested that three (3) day large events may be  
154 appropriate but would recommend leaving that up to the discretion of the Zoning Administrator  
155 on a case-by-case basis. He stated that the "weekend" is defined as Friday and Saturday, but if a  
156 waiver is granted by the Zoning Administrator, it could possibly be extended an additional day  
157 under certain circumstances. He stated that this option would provide more flexibility for the  
158 applicant. He asked the Planning Commission if they agreed with the proposed statement.  
159 There were no objections.

160  
161 Chairman Meisel continued to work through the use statement. He made note of the term  
162 "accessory services" to describe entities other than Vale Royal, LLC permitted to utilize the  
163 venue. Brian Keeseey suggested using the term "subcontracted services" instead. The Planning  
164 Commission agreed that the term would be more appropriate.

165  
166 Chairman Meisel asked the Planning Commission if they believed the proposed use statement  
167 was acceptable after the suggested minor revisions. There were no objections. He asked the  
168 applicant if there were any additional thoughts or concerns regarding the use statement. No  
169 additional thoughts or concerns were expressed.

170  
171 Chairman Meisel stated that there were several considerations for the Planning Commission  
172 including approval of the Special Land Use and the issuance of a Land Use Permit. He asked the  
173 Planning Commission if anyone had any additional thoughts or concerns with any aspect of the  
174 Special Land Use. Kurt Schulze asked if the sanitary sewer aspect and everything else has been  
175 addressed. Chairman Meisel brought up the documentation and correspondence relating to the  
176 sanitary sewer aspect of the Special Land Use. He stated that all of the notes on the site plan  
177 have been updated to include accurate information. He stated there are two main questions  
178 regarding the sanitary sewer; available sewer capacity in relation to the size, number, and  
179 duration of events, and the well pump capacity in relation to the sewer system and the fire  
180 suppression system. He stated that the Livingston County Health Department (LCHD) had

181 signed off on the well pump capacity in relation to the sanitary sewer system and the Livingston  
182 County Drain Commissioner's Office (LCDC) had effectively stated that the applicant's  
183 engineer has provided adequate information on the grinder pump capacity and they are agreeable  
184 with the assessment provided. He continued, stating that the well pump concern in relation to the  
185 fire suppression system has been resolved since the proposed fire suppression system would  
186 utilize a large water storage tank with an independent water pump instead of being directly  
187 connected to the well pump. Chairman Meisel stated that he is satisfied with the information that  
188 has been provided regarding the sanitary sewer and fire suppression system capacities. Dave  
189 Wardin stated that he is satisfied that his previous concerns have been addressed. There were no  
190 objections from the rest of the Planning Commission.

191  
192 Dave Wardin asked for clarification on the parking space calculations on the site plan since the  
193 number provided did not match up with the number depicted. Brian Keesey stated that there was  
194 a discrepancy in the number because two (2) of the parking spaces included in the calculations  
195 are located within the detached garage. Dave Wardin requested that the applicant add an  
196 additional note on the site plan indicating that two (2) of the parking spaces are located within  
197 the garage to prevent any potential confusion.

198  
199 Chairman Meisel stated that he had an additional question regarding the use statement. He asked  
200 the Planning Commission what they thought about referencing the Fire Chief's approval letter in  
201 the use statement since it would not be referenced on the site plan. He suggested referencing the  
202 date of the letter in the use statement, the date being March 20<sup>th</sup>, 2018 and asked the Planning  
203 Commission for opinions. Dave Wardin suggested adding a statement to the end of the use  
204 statement indicating that the use statement may be modified if any changes occur. Kurt Schulze  
205 stated that Dave Wardin's suggestion would also provide a backup reference to how the  
206 maximum capacity of one hundred and sixty-three (163) people was determined. The Planning  
207 Commission and applicant agreed on the proposed statement.

208  
209 Chairman Meisel summarized the revisions to the use statement that had been discussed. He  
210 stated that the revisions to the site plan included adding a note regarding the number of parking  
211 spaces and the maximum capacity being increased to one hundred and sixty-three (163)  
212 (following the installation and approval of the fire suppression system) and removing the note  
213 referencing the boulder retaining wall. He stated that the Planning Commission still needs to  
214 determine what needs to be done with the statement on the site plan regarding the driveway  
215 approach improvements required by the Livingston County Road Commission (LCRC) which  
216 have not yet been completed. He suggested that the Planning Commission should agree upon a  
217 timeframe for the driveway approach improvements to include in the motion. There was a brief  
218 discussion amongst the Planning Commission on establishing a timeline for the driveway  
219 approach improvements. The Planning Commission agreed upon the condition that the driveway  
220 approach improvement project is started by June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2018 and completed within three (3) to four  
221 (4) weeks, making note that the Zoning Administrator could permit an extension if, for any  
222 reason, circumstances exist that prevent the project from being completed within the agreed upon  
223 timeframe.

224  
225 Chairman Meisel asked the Planning Commission if they had any further questions or comments  
226 regarding the application. Cam Gonzalez stated that the seasonal dates of operation appear to be

227 relatively limited. He asked the applicant if those dates were proposed based on her own  
228 preferences or if it was a condition imposed by the Planning Commission during the initial  
229 Special Land Use approval. Valerie Johnson stated that she came up with the seasonal dates  
230 independently since the barn is not insulated or heated and, therefore, she does not intend on  
231 hosting events during the winter months. Chairman Meisel asked if there were any additional  
232 questions from the Planning Commission. Dave Wardin asked for clarification on whether there  
233 should be motions for both the site plan amendment and Special Land Use. Chairman Meisel  
234 confirmed that both motions would be required. Kurt Schulze asked if any of the approvals  
235 would be conditional on completion of the previously discussed revisions and the driveway  
236 approach improvements. Chairman Meisel stated that approval of the site plan would be  
237 conditional upon making the requested revisions and submitting certified copies to the  
238 Township. He continued, stating that the revised use statement should be submitted with no  
239 additional conditions attached. He stated that the approval would be conditional on completion  
240 of the required driveway approach improvements. Brian Keesey mentioned that the driveway  
241 approach improvement condition should be attached to the Special Land Use approval and not  
242 the site plan approval. Chairman Meisel agreed and thanked Brian Keesey for the clarification.  
243

244 Dave Wardin made a motion to recommend Township Board approval of the Vale Royal site  
245 plan amendment conditional upon completion of the revisions suggested by the Planning  
246 Commission inclusive of increasing the maximum barn capacity from one hundred and sixty  
247 (160) to one hundred and sixty-three (163) people and minor drafting modifications. Cam  
248 Gonzalez supported the motion. The motion carried by unanimous voice vote.  
249

250 Dave Wardin made a motion to recommend Township Board approval of the Vale Royal Special  
251 Land Use amendment at this time, suggesting that the final approval be conditional upon start of  
252 construction to address the LCRC driveway approach improvement requirements to start no later  
253 than June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2018 and to be completed four (4) to six (6) weeks thereafter. Cam Gonzalez  
254 supported the motion. The motion carried by unanimous voice vote.  
255

256 Chairman Meisel asked the applicant if she now understands that it is much easier and less  
257 costly to keep the Township informed on any proposed modifications to the Special Land Use  
258 and/or site plan than to make nonpermitted modifications. He stated that the Township has been  
259 and will continue to be willing to consider any reasonable proposals for modifications as long as  
260 adequate communication and compliance is maintained. He continued, stating that the Township  
261 wants the operation to be successful and will be open to considering future changes to help it  
262 stay competitive with similar venues assuming that a good relationship is maintained.  
263

264 Valerie Johnson asked the Planning Commission if it would be possible to allow large events to  
265 take place prior to the completion of the required fire suppression system through utilization of a  
266 large tent for any additional people above the maximum of ninety-nine (99) permitted in the  
267 barn. She explained that she will not likely be able to receive Livingston County Building  
268 Department approval of the fire suppression system before one or potentially more of the  
269 scheduled weddings and proposed utilizing a fire watch (one (1) to two (2) off-duty firefighters  
270 present in the barn to perform head counts on the number of people inside the barn at any given  
271 time during an event). Chairman Meisel suggested to Ross Nicholson that he contact the Fire  
272 Chief on the applicant's behalf to inquire about the possibility of allowing fire watches in the

273 short-term to allow her to host the scheduled events with over ninety-nine (99) people prior the  
274 installation and approval of the fire suppression system. Ross Nicholson agreed. Valerie  
275 Johnson took a moment to explain that she has had conversations with a number of Fire Chiefs  
276 and proprietors of similar event venues within municipalities outside of the Township which all  
277 do not have fire suppression requirements and permit fire watches as an alternative measure for  
278 controlling maximum capacity requirements. Chairman Meisel explained that the only opinion  
279 that matters in this case is that of the local Fire Chief having jurisdiction. He continued,  
280 explaining that there are many factors that the Fire Chief needs to consider when determining the  
281 maximum capacity for event venues, many of which are site-specific. He stated that the  
282 Township would continue to research the standards to determine how these types of decisions are  
283 made in comparison to those of other municipalities.

284  
285 *The item was closed at 8:09 pm.*

286  
287 **OLD BUSINESS # 2 (8:10 pm): Detached Accessory Structures on Adjacent Lots**

288  
289 Chairman Meisel introduced the agenda item, explaining that it is a continuation of discussion on  
290 a proposed Zoning Ordinance amendment to permit detached accessory structures without a  
291 principle structure as a special land use. He then asked Brian Keesey if he would take a moment  
292 to outline the revisions to the memo he had prepared for the draft ordinance text.

293  
294 Brian Keesey summarized some of the changes he had made to the draft ordinance text since the  
295 last discussion on the topic. He explained that the original draft stated that the provisions would  
296 be applied based on accessory structures in only the LK-1 (Lake Front Residential) district,  
297 which has been moved to the section which applies to all zoning districts. Chairman Meisel  
298 inquired if the intent is to actually include all zoning districts or be specific to all residential  
299 zoning districts. There was a brief discussion between Brian Keesey and the Planning  
300 Commission regarding whether or not the draft should be revised to specify residential districts  
301 as opposed to all zoning districts, including commercial districts. Brian Keesey stated that he  
302 would prefer that it remains applicable to all districts since the standards within the rest of the  
303 draft ordinance text are specific enough that the standards could only be applied in residential  
304 districts. He cited several examples of verbiage which specifies residential uses (which are  
305 prohibited in commercial zoning districts). Chairman Meisel asked if additional language should  
306 be included under the applicability section to add more clarity. Dave Wardin stated that the  
307 applicability requirement already includes the requirement to have lake frontage which would  
308 exclude all commercial properties. Chairman Meisel agreed but noted that there is a property  
309 zoned EI (Extractive Industrial) which does have lake frontage. He also noted that golf courses  
310 could potentially be considered to have lake frontage based on the Zoning Ordinance definition  
311 of “lake”, which includes other classifications of wetland areas. The Planning Commission and  
312 Brian Keesey briefly discussed what the best language would be to specify residential properties  
313 within the applicability requirements. It was determined that the text should specify that the  
314 provisions would apply to all single-family zoning districts.

315  
316 Brian Keesey continued to explain the changes that had been made to the draft since the last  
317 discussion. He took a moment to discuss the section which pertains to neighborhood  
318 associations. He stated that he typically does not recommend the Township get involved with

319 association matters, however, in this instance he feels it may be appropriate to request some type  
320 of association approval to help ensure neighborhood compatibility. Chairman Meisel explained  
321 that there are many different types of associations, ranging from weak to strong (in terms of the  
322 amount of power they have to control architectural and/or developmental standards). He  
323 continued, stating that in terms of several past Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) applications, it  
324 has been requested that applicants provide evidence of association approval or waiver for  
325 properties located within the jurisdiction of strong associations. The Planning Commission  
326 agreed that the language pertaining to association approval should remain in the draft.

327  
328 Brian Keesey continued explaining the changes to the draft ordinance text. He stated that the  
329 vegetative screening on side and rear facades requirement was removed since the primary intent  
330 of the text is to ensure compatibility with the neighborhood (so vegetative screening would not  
331 apply in all scenarios). He stated that he is proposing to leave the determination of neighborhood  
332 compatibility at the discretion of the Planning Commission. He stated that the minimum floor  
333 area requirements have been slightly modified to match the minimum floor area for single family  
334 dwellings as well. The Planning Commission and Brian Keesey briefly discussed the issue of  
335 minimum and maximum floor area. It was decided that the text should be changed to specify  
336 minimum and maximum *ground* floor area to help ensure compatibility with single-family  
337 dwellings in the area. The discussion continued to determine the best wording for the section.  
338 Brian Keesey stated that he would work on the language to be reviewed at a future meeting.

339  
340 The Planning Commission briefly discussed the section of the draft text pertaining to  
341 landscaping and property maintenance requirements. The current draft stated that regular  
342 mowing of turf would be required. The Planning Commission determined that the statement  
343 should read differently to indicate that the landscaping and maintenance should be done in  
344 accordance with the character of the neighborhood since not all neighborhoods have the same  
345 landscaping characteristics.

346  
347 Brian Keesey continued through the changes to the draft. He stated that the last revision pertains  
348 to the dissolving of any existing deed restrictions and mechanism to permanently tie the property  
349 containing a principal structure to the semi-adjacent property containing the outbuilding. He  
350 stated that the revised draft text indicates that the Township Board may consider dissolving deed  
351 restrictions tying the properties together for sale or use only if the outbuilding has been removed  
352 or converted to a structure which can be utilized for a permitted principal use. The Planning  
353 Commission briefly discussed the proposed text revision regarding the potential for dissolution  
354 of deed restrictions to determine the best language. The discussion reminded Brian Keesey of  
355 another potential issue with the draft ordinance regarding occupancy of outbuildings. He  
356 suggested adding language that would prohibit utilizing a portion of the outbuilding for  
357 occupancy. The Planning Commission continued discussing the dissolution of deed restrictions.  
358 Brian Keesey stated that he would revise the draft text pertaining to deed restrictions based on  
359 the comments from the discussion.

360  
361 *The item was closed at 9:06 pm.*

362  
363 **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:**



364 **MISC. BUSINESS #1 (9:07 pm): Livingston County Health Department Cemetery**  
365 **Standards**

366  
367 Chairman Meisel introduced the topic, explaining that a recent application for a privately owned  
368 and operated cemetery has brought up several questions regarding the Livingston County Health  
369 Department (LCHD) guidelines for cemeteries. The Planning Commission briefly discussed the  
370 items from the LCHD document which they would like to request clarification on in order to  
371 more adequately respond to concerns presented by residents residing near the proposed cemetery  
372 site. The Planning Commission decided that they would compile a list of questions to be  
373 presented to the LCHD regarding their cemetery guidelines. They also determined that it would  
374 be beneficial to request that a representative from the LCHD be present during the next meeting  
375 that the cemetery application is discussed in order to provide information directly to the  
376 concerned residents (since the LCHD is the environmental health and safety authority having  
377 jurisdiction).

378  
379 *The item was closed at 9:22 pm*

- 380  
381 1) Planning and Zoning Administrator's Report: None  
382 2) Other Business Items: None  
383 3) Township Board Actions: None  
384 4) ZBA Report: None  
385 5) Future Items: N/A  
386 6) Correspondence: N/A

387  
388  
389 **ADJOURNMENT: 9:23 pm**