

VEVAY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION  
Regular/Public Hearing Meeting  
Wednesday, June 4, 2014  
Vevay Township Hall – 7:00 p.m.

---

MINUTES

**Members present:** Stacy Byers, Roger Cargill, Jack Cady, John Lazet, Ilene Thayer, and Bruce Walker.

**Member absent:** None.

**Other Persons present:** Supervisor Gary Howe, consultant Mark Eidelson, and legal counsel Gordon Van Wieren.

**I. Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Thayer.

**II. Pledge of Allegiance**

The audience joined the Commission in reciting the Pledge of Allegiance.

**III. Set/Amend Agenda**

The agenda was accepted as presented.

**IV. Approval of 5-7-14 Regular Meeting Minutes**

There were no amendments to the minutes.

**MOTION Walker, seconded by Cady, to approve the May 7, 2014 regular meeting minutes as submitted.**

**CARRIED**

**V. Brief Public Comment**

Greg Shaw – has had conversation with the Supervisor and some Commission members this evening, and wants to move his wife’s residential trailer to his property for temporary storage while they find a new placement. The Commission had allowed a similar placement back in 2007. Chair Thayer – noted that his previous situation was under the prior Ordinance, and is not covered in the current Ordinance. She recommended he submit a letter to the Township requesting an Ordinance amendment.

**VI. Recess to Public Hearing**

*Zoning Ordinance Signs and Lot Widths Amendments*

**SIGNS:** Mr. Eidelson – gave a brief overview of the proposed amendments. The current Ordinance has repeated regulations with minor variations in several places throughout the Ordinance, causing difficulty in having people understand exactly how the regulations are to be applied. Some commonly used signs are not currently allowed or the Ordinance is silent, such as

a temporary builder's sign. Some provisions are vague. The proposed amendments are intended to address signs that are reasonable, to clarify language, remove non-essential language, allow for more flexibility in lighting of signs, and replace the current language throughout the Ordinance with a new Chapter 20 that is inclusive for all sign regulations. Proposed basic standards are as currently allowed, but with more clarity, and more detail. Based on public comment in April, several additional changes have been proposed: in proposed section 20.04, a new subsection on flags has been added; in proposed section 20.05, the numbers in the Table on sign sizes was changed from 24 square feet to 32; the maximum allowable EMC size has been increased from 50% to 60%; and proposed section 20.06 has a new subsection to address seasonal off-premises signs.

**LOT WIDTH AND FRONTAGE:** Mr. Eidelson – explained that all of the proposed changes based on public comment in April are very similar to the first proposal. The current Ordinance could most likely be interpreted to measure lot widths at the front yard set-back from the right-of-way, but this is not a common means of measurement. Most jurisdictions require that measurements be along the front lot line. This is seen in Sec. 3.06 on street access, and also in Sec. 3.07 when the parcel is on a cul-de-sac. All of the proposed amendments are intended to clarify the point of measurement as the right-of-way line. Sec. 3.07 has been amended to clarify how a lot width is measured on curvilinear road segments only in plats or subdivisions, as opposed to anywhere in the Township where a road is curved.

Gayle Chipchase, 1101 Tuttle Road:

- Asked if the proposal would allow a shared driveway in the narrow section of a flag lot? **Mr. Eidelson** – No. He pointed to current Ordinance language in subsection (c) of Section 3.06, which is the only place in the Ordinance that addresses shared driveways. The new language on shared driveways in subsection (a) is due to the current language in (c), which only applies to an Access Management Overlay District, and nowhere else.
- Commented that in her opinion, shared driveways never work, as owners can change and disputes arise. She also opposes allowing for land-locked lots that depend on a shared driveway for access. **Comm. Cady** – Shared driveways are often included in deeds, and a parcel cannot be built upon without having 200 foot of road frontage. **Chair Thayer** – the Township does not allow for private roads, or for shared driveways, which are a variation of a private road.
- Asked if proposed 3.07 (b) is adopted, could a flag lot such as Bullen Estates be further developed if the road is extended? **Comm. Cady** – Bullen Estates was platted, and the road was turned over to the County so it is now a County road ~~for~~ that qualifies parcels for frontage requirements.
- Asked if the street in Sleeping Meadows was extended, could it be developed as a cul-de-sac as it was part of a flag lot? **Mr. Eidelson** – either by design of the builder or by Road Commission requirement, plats commonly leave road stubs to neighboring parcels in case those lots are ever developed. Access to other County roads may be down the narrow part of the lot if that road is a County road. The proposed language significantly narrows the application of measuring lot width in this section.

## **VII. Adjournment of Pubic Hearing and Recommencement of Regular Meeting**

There being no further public comment, the public hearing was adjourned at 7:39 pm, and the regular meeting recommenced.

## **VIII. Reports**

A. May 2014 AGS Building/Zoning Report

The report indicated that there had been 11 permit applications: one for a restoration after a fire, a renewal of a permit for a tower, adding a deck to a residence, a re-inspection of a residence, two for adding a pole barn, and five permits for placement of piers in Mason Manor. There were no complaints or authorizations to enforce.

B. Special Land Use (SLU) Check-off Sheets

1. SLU permit #115.01 – Ivy Mineral Water/Mike Stringer – Service Road south of Tomlinson – Salt Water/Mineral Well

The operations are active and the annual fee has been paid. There have been no complaints and no change in operations, which are expected to start up for the season in about 2 weeks.

2. SLU permit #123 – Lansing Hit Club/Pierce, Justin and Harris, Roy – 839 Eden Road – Indoor Recreation Facility

The operations are active, and the annual fee has been paid. There have been no complaints and no change in operations.

To preserve his right to vote on the SLU permit renewals when they are considered by the Township Board, Comm. Walker recused himself from voting on the following motion:

**MOTION Byers, seconded by Walker, to recommend to the Township Board renewal of SLU permits #115.01, and #123.  
CARRIED**

**IX. Pending Business**

A. Proposed Zoning Ordinance Signs and Lot Widths Amendments

**Signs and Lot Widths:**

COMMISSION – in conformity with Sec. 19.05 for recommending Ordinance amendments to the Township Board of Trustees, found that:

- Proposing a new section addressing signs in a single place, and language on measuring lot width in curved roads would clarify the intent of the Ordinance;
- The proposed text amendments would update the Ordinance to reflect the new name of the Ingham County Road Department;
- The proposed text amendments ensure conformity of the Ordinance with newly adopted state law on billboards;
- The proposed text amendments are in compliance with County, State and Federal regulations;
- Though the text amendments would allow for EMC signs in an Agriculture District, the allowance is only along a narrowly defined US-127 corridor, which is fully consistent with the character of the range of uses provided for within Agriculture Districts in that portion of the Township;

- The proposed text amendments do not create incompatible land uses within a zoning district, or between adjacent districts;
- After hearing from a nationally known billboard and commercial sign firm, as well as from other research and discussion of signs in various jurisdictions across the state and Township, the proposed text amendments reflect appropriate requirements, contemporary building practices, environmental requirements, and similar technical items;
- As applicable, the proposed **change** *changes* are consistent with the Township's ability to provide adequate public facilities and services; and
- The proposed changes are consistent with the Township's desire to protect the public health, safety, and welfare of the community.

To preserve his right to vote on the proposed Zoning Ordinance amendments when they are considered by the Township Board, Comm. Walker recused himself from voting on the following motions:

**MOTION Walker, seconded by Cady, to recommend to the Board of Trustees approval of the proposed Zoning Ordinance amendments #1-10 on signs, as set forth in the memorandum from Mr. Eidelson dated May 14, 2014. Carried, 5-0.**

**MOTION Byers, seconded by Walker, to recommend to the Board of Trustees approval of the proposed Zoning Ordinance amendments #11-13 on lot width, as set forth in the memorandum from Mr. Eidelson dated May 14, 2014. Carried, 5-0.**

A. Master Plan Review

Mr. Eidelson – walked the Commission through the law requiring that a Master Plan be reviewed every 5 years, and that the minutes of those meetings document the review. The purpose of the review is to determine if the Master Plan should be amended or completely re-written. He had sent correspondence dated May 28, 2014 detailing the law and including “Considerations” the Commission ought to keep in mind during this review. He has not yet reviewed the Master Plan, but wanted the Commission to have a framework for future deliberation. The Commission will need to consider how comfortable they are with the current Master Plan.

Chair Thayer – commented that there has been a change in districts (Highway Service), law enforcement coverage has changed, and some references will need changing, but overall the maintenance of rural character is good. COMMISSION – discussed that as development is changing, matters such as broadband coverage should be kept in mind. It was noted that the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission provided the various maps when the Master Plan was adopted 10 years ago. Aerial maps with overlay of parcel lines should be available later this year; there is likely to be a cost.

COMMISSION – discussed how best to have commissioners approach the review so that there aren't several different individual approaches that would be time-consuming to coordinate. Mr. Eidelson recommended a chapter by chapter approach. He will update all data, and he recommended the Commission focus on the main goals of the Plan. In 2003, a survey had been sent to residents, and public forums held such as open houses. The Commission also met with farm groups, and depending on the upcoming results of a review, the level of public involvement

should be determined. Mr. Van Wieren commented that legal counsel will not duplicate efforts and thereby raise costs, as they will coordinate their review with Mr. Eidelson. Mr. Eidelson noted that he is not available for the August 6 regular meeting.

**MOTION Byers, seconded by Cady, to schedule a special Commission meeting on August 20<sup>th</sup> at 6:00 pm to continue the review of the Master Plan.  
CARRIED, 6-0.**

**X. Any Other Business**

Comm. Walker – encouraged people to sign up for the Township email, especially as it would be helpful in promoting public knowledge of the Master Plan review.

**IX. Additional Public Comment**

Greg Shaw – asked if notice of the June 25 public hearing has been published yet, and if that would be a time to bring up the amendment to the Ordinance he mentioned earlier in the meeting? He was directed to Sec. 19.05 (c), which details how he would ask for a change in the Ordinance.

Greg Shaw – On June 19, the new stage at Rayner Park will be dedicated, and June 21 will be the Rayner Shine Carnival to raise funds for the Park.

Gayle Chipchase – is on the email list and appreciates the updates on what's happening in the Township.

**X. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:31 p.m.

---

John Lazet, Secretary