

1 **TYRONE TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION**
2 **REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**
3 **September 10, 2019 7:00 p.m.**
4
5

6 **PRESENT:** Mark Meisel, Dave Wardin, Kurt Schulze, Rich Erickson, Perry Green, Dan Stickel,
7 and Bill Wood.

8
9 **ABSENT:** None

10
11 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Tyrone Township Planner Susan Cronander and Tyrone Township
12 Planning & Zoning Administrator Ross Nicholson

13
14 **CALL TO ORDER (7:05 pm):** The meeting was called to order by Chairman Mark Meisel.

15
16 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE (7:05 pm):**

17
18 **CALL TO THE PUBLIC (7:06 pm):**

19
20 No public comments or questions were received.

21
22 **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA (7:07 pm):**

23
24 Kurt Schulze made a motion to approve the agenda as presented. Dave Wardin supported the
25 motion. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

26
27 *Chairman Meisel took a moment to introduce and welcome Dan Stickel to the Planning*
28 *Commission.*

29
30 **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES (7:08 pm):**

31
32 Minor revisions were made to the draft July 9, 2019 meeting minutes. Dave Wardin made a
33 motion to approve the July 9, 2019 meeting minutes as amended. Perry Green supported the
34 motion. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

35
36 *Dave Wardin made a motion to suspend the order of business, placing New Business Item #1*
37 *(The Sanctuary at Tyrone Site Condominium) ahead of all other business items. Kurt Schulze*
38 *supported the motion. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.*

39
40 **NEW BUSINESS #1 (7:12 pm): The Sanctuary at Tyrone Site Condominium:**

41
42 Chairman Meisel briefly summarized and introduced the application. He explained that the
43 application has been revised since the original submission and has changed from thirty-one (31)
44 proposed units on a sixty-two (62) acre site to thirty-six (36) proposed units on a seventy-two
45 (72) acre parcel.

46 Dan Boss introduced himself, Brent LaVanway, and Steve Morgan (applicants). He summarized
47 the original concept plan and compared it to the revised site plan. He explained that the ten (10)
48 acre parcel adjacent (northwest) to the original site was acquired and included into the revised
49 site plan with the intent of creating a more desirable layout for better traffic flow, function, and
50 aesthetics. He continued, stating that they are seeking approval of the site condominium at the
51 same density which had received conceptual approval under the previous layout. He explained
52 that the original site plan was not up to his standards as a developer and was designed in a way
53 that was dictated by the configuration of the 62-acre parcel. He stated that the revised layout on
54 72-acres would be much more desirable to all parties involved since it would offer better fire
55 department access, no cul-de-sacs, less tree-removal, and improved sight distance at both
56 proposed entrance locations.

57
58 Chairman Meisel stated (for clarification) that the revised site plan is considered as a new
59 business item because it is ultimately a new plan and, as such, must go through all required steps
60 in the site condominium approval process including agency reviews. He suggested that Susan
61 Cronander read through the McKenna review letter that had been prepared for the application.
62 Susan Cronander read through the review letter. She stated that the most significant issue with
63 the new site plan is that the proposed density would be noncompliant under the current zoning,
64 even when utilizing the Cluster Development Option (CDO).

65
66 Chairman Meisel stated that there are several conflicts and difficulties in attempting to approve
67 the site plan as presented, primarily that there is no known development option or mechanism in
68 the Zoning Ordinance which would allow for the property with the unit sizes as proposed. The
69 Planning Commission briefly discussed the application and looked through the Zoning
70 Ordinance to see if anything could be utilized in order to achieve the proposed unit sizes. No
71 solution was found. The Planning Commission agreed that the latest proposed site plan is a
72 significantly better plan than the initial version, however, a mechanism must be found to legally
73 permit the proposed development before any recommendation for approval could be offered.

74
75 Scott Dietrich (resident in attendance) asked if the applicants have provided soil information
76 pertaining to the area where the proposed community septic system would be located. Brent
77 LaVanway replied, explaining that they have performed extensive testing on the soils and they
78 have been found to be suitable for the proposed on-site sewage treatment system.

79
80 Dan Boss asked the Planning Commission if it would be possible to recommend approval of the
81 development if they were to reconfigure the proposed site condominium where five (5) units are
82 removed and the ten (10) acre parcel would be utilized only for the private road. Chairman
83 Meisel explained that the plan would still be significantly different than that which received
84 conceptual approval under the previous minimum lot sizes, therefore, submitting a revised
85 application as proposed would not adequately address the density aspect.

86
87 *The item was closed at 8:20 pm.*

88
89

90 **OLD BUSINESS #1 (8:21 pm): Pool Covers:**

91
92 Chairman Meisel introduced the topic and summarized where the Planning Commission had left
93 off in discussion. He stated that the general consensus amongst the Planning Commission is that
94 there may be potential liability involved in permitting swimming pools with an ASTM (ASTM
95 International, formerly known as the American Society for Testing and Materials) compliant
96 safety cover in leu of fully-fenced enclosures and self-latching gates.
97

98 Don Peitz (resident in attendance) presented the Planning Commission with some information on
99 ASTM-compliant safety covers. He explained that the ASTM sets international standards for
100 safety. He continued, stating that the ASTM developed certification provides guidelines for pool
101 safety covers which are recognized by the State of Michigan as a suitable alternative for fenced
102 enclosures with self-latching gates. He explained to the Planning Commission that there is
103 significant personal responsibility which comes with pool ownership. He stated that there is no
104 substitute for adult supervision in preventing accidental drownings but, recognizing that it may
105 not be possible at all times, he would trust an ASTM-compliant safety cover verses a fence as a
106 secondary safety precaution. He explained that fences can be damaged or climbed, whereas an
107 ASTM-compliant pool cover cannot be as easily penetrated. He described the configuration of
108 his property and elaborated as to why, in his specific situation, a fence would do little to nothing
109 to act as a barrier and an ASTM-compliant safety cover is the most viable option in terms of
110 safety mechanisms. The Planning Commission briefly discussed the topic. Scott Dietrich
111 (resident in attendance) stated that, in his experience, many people who own in-ground pools
112 have fencing and a gate, however, they are generally propped open or utilized incorrectly-
113 rendering them virtually useless. Chairman Meisel stated that all of the information discussed is
114 good, but additional research will be necessary prior to making any decisions.
115

116 *The item was closed at 8:51 pm.*
117

118 **OLD BUSINESS #2 (8:51 pm): Sight Line Regulations:**

119
120 Chairman Meisel summarized the previous discussions on sight line regulations. He brought up
121 a working draft of potential methods to evaluate and regulate sight lines for construction on
122 lakefront properties. Christine Eby (public in attendance) addressed the Planning Commission to
123 discuss a property she intends to build a house on in the future. She explained where she would
124 like to build on a lakefront lot in relation to the existing adjacent development. The situation she
125 described would not comply with the current sight line regulations, however, she indicated that
126 the proposed construction would not adversely affect adjacent waterfront views. The Planning
127 Commission discussed the specific scenario presented by Christine Eby. They continued to
128 discuss the potential standards and methodology and updated the draft.
129

130 Christine Eby asked the Planning Commission if it would be possible for them to perform a site
131 visit of the property in question so that she could better demonstrate to the Planning Commission
132 the scenario they had been discussing. The Planning Commission briefly discussed. Chairman
133 Meisel stated that he believed they could meet at the site for the next workshop meeting. The
134 Planning Commission agreed. The workshop meeting was tentatively scheduled for the
135 following Thursday at 6:00 pm at the subject property.

136

137 *The item was closed at 9:51 pm.*

138

139 *The meeting was adjourned at 9:52 pm.*