

VEVAY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION  
Special Meeting  
Wednesday, October 21, 2015  
Vevay Township Hall – 6:00 p.m.

---

MINUTES

**Members present:** Jack Cady, Richard Lacasse, John Lazet, Pattie McNeilly, Ilene Thayer, Wayne Uzzle, and Bruce Walker.

**Member absent:** None.

**Other Persons present:** Supervisor Jesse Ramey, and Planner Mark Eidelson.

**I. Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at 6:05 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. Brief Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**V. Pending Business**

A. Master Plan Deliberations

1.) Landplan Correspondence dated 9-1-15

(As discussion on the three agenda items was combined on each topic, all notes below include items 2) and 3) under this item of business.)

Mr. Eidelson – a number of key issues needing to be addressed have been previously identified by the Commission. That list is appended to his memorandum.

For clarification, the Master Plan sets the development policy for the Township. The Zoning Ordinance should be the implementation of the policy goals and recommendations of the Plan. While the Plan does not legally prohibit or over-ride specific items in the Ordinance, any conflict or ambiguity in the Ordinance should be looked at in the context of the Master Plan. The Commission will likely need to recommend various Ordinance amendments, depending on the final version of the new Master Plan.

The Township has a new supervisor since discussion of the Master Plan review started, as well as 2 new Commission members. The Board of Trustees discussed the matter and the Commission remains the final approving authority of the new Plan. Needed Zoning Ordinance amendments can be discussed and drafted during the review of the Master Plan, but need not be adopted concurrently with the new Plan. They can be recommended to the Board either at the time of Master Plan approval or later.

The Master Plan has to include a zoning plan, density limitations, and lot sizes. Any changes from the current Plan would only affect future developments, not existing development. While proposed platted development would have to be approved by the state, such development is still subject to a number of local regulations.

**Revision Issue E** – the Agricultural/Rural residential district covers nearly the entire Township. The Plan currently recommends “maximum development densities of approximately one dwelling per two to three acres”, or allowing for slightly higher density “...to landowners who pursue innovative development measures” (page 3-2, last two paragraphs). Current residential development in the Zoning Ordinance is by right if the parcel size is 2 acres or more (Sec. 5.03).

Open space preservation, as pictured on page 3-4 of the Master Plan as Example B (Clustering), allows for a density not currently allowed in the Zoning Ordinance as the parcel sizes in clustering are smaller. The Ordinance would need to be amended to allow smaller parcels as long as the development met all health department requirements, and set aside (for example) at least 50% of the mother parcel as open space. The only possible existing cluster-type development in the Township is thought to be that off of Dexter Trail, north of Kipp Road.

If lot size is increased or density requirements lowered, a consideration should be the reality of farmland development. As noted in his memorandum, historically Township development has tended towards smaller parcels along the roads, leading to an increasingly residential look among the farmed parcels. In a cluster development the road would have to be built to county standards as the Township does not allow for private roads. In a cluster development the “permanent open space” would be by easement to ensure its preservation.

There was discussion on:

- possibly preserving open space by requiring larger parcels for development, but then allowing for more intensive development via clustering.
- whether as opposed to lot size, it would be better to talk about allowable developmental density and open space requirements of the mother parcel.
- preserving the rural nature of the Township through the use of setbacks in the Ordinance.
- encouraging cluster development by reducing density to one residence per acre in the developed portion of the parcel.

Mr. Eidelson will draft language that incorporates tonight’s discussion on Revision Issue E.

**Revision Issue D** – transfer of development rights (TDR). The goal in the drafting of the Master Plan in 2004 had been to allow a greater density for parcel owners closer to other development, such as the City of Mason, in exchange for the selling parcel to remain as open property having an easement prohibiting development. The Commission discussed:

- How TDRs work in other jurisdictions

- The absence of TDR in the Ordinance.
- How allowing so much development, including cluster developments, based on the density of one residence per 2 acres, reduces the incentive for Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) and TDR transactions.
- The difficulty of fully utilizing TDRs at the Township level as it takes substantial amounts of land to make a meaningful difference in how development can be encouraged and limited.
- The alternate form of development allowed in the Ordinance under the Planned Unit Development chapter.

Mr. Eidelson was asked to draft language minimizing the Master Plan emphasis on TDRs.

**Revision Issue F** – Suburban Residential Area (SRA). Currently the designated SRAs are near the City of Mason and along the major roads coming out of Mason. The Commission discussed:

- Re-zoning parcels as needed in the SRAs to R-1 or R-2 to allow for more intensive development.
- It was noted that the designated SRAs would also oppose re-zoning for more intense residential development outside of the mapped area.
- How the current SRAs are close to city services, especially on the east side of the City, and have already mostly been developed.
- While platting allows for smaller parcels, the provision of sewer and water would likely determine that type of development.
- How to encourage development off of the main roads into interior areas of parcels.
- The relatively small amount of prime farmland in the SRAs.
- Possible utilization of the PUD provisions of the Ordinance to direct the location of more intense residential development.
- Potentially developing a policy of higher developmental densities within the immediate proximity of Mason; perhaps within a half mile.
- The proposed re-zoning on Hull Road to B-2, and possibly amending the Master Plan's future land use map.
- Encouraging higher density development closer to Mason
- The high percentage of the Township designated for SRA, and whether the size of the SRAs should be reduced.
- It was noted that the Ordinance does have Master Plan support for its re-zoning provisions.
- The need to amend Section 11.04 of the Ordinance if the new Master Plan language on the SRA definition is changed.

Mr. Eidelson was asked to tweak the SRA definition by specifying that:

- Long-term primary uses should be single family and two-family residences, including opportunities for comparatively higher density small-lot subdivisions where adequate provisions are made for potable water and sewage disposal.
- Secondary uses should include alternative living arrangements such as townhouses, apartments, retirement centers, and similar housing options.
- Maximum development densities should typically not exceed one dwelling per approximately one-half acre, provided adequate measures are in place for sewage disposal and potable water.

- Development densities greater than three dwellings per acre may be reasonable but only after special review to determine if the project is appropriate on the proposed property, taking into consideration such matters as available infrastructure and services, anticipated impacts upon existing residential development and/or neighborhoods, and on-site natural features.
- The SRA boundaries should shrink in closer to the city, to roughly within one-half mile but depending on existing development, natural features, etc.

The Commission requested an updated plat map. Mr. Eidelson will see what is available.

**Motion Uzzle, seconded by McNeilly, that a special meeting to continue Master Plan discussions be scheduled for Wednesday, December 2, starting at 6:00 pm.  
CARRIED.**

While the Commission had spent 2.5 hours discussing the Master Plan, any decisions as to specific concepts or details are to depend on having language drafted and refined before receiving Commission approval.

#### **VI. Any Other Business**

No other business was discussed.

#### **VII. Additional Public Comment**

There was no additional public comment.

#### **VIII. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:43 p.m.

---

John Lazet, Secretary