

VEVAY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
Special Meeting
Wednesday, December 2, 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: Planner Mark Eidelson.

I. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 6:00 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. Brief Public Comment

There was no public comment.

V. Pending Business

A. Master Plan Deliberations

1.) Landplan Correspondence dated 11-19-15

Mr. Eidelson – reported that in the near future, hopefully by the regular December 9 meeting, Commissioners should be receiving drafts of revisions pursuant to discussions and decisions of the Commission. Appendices will come first, then chapters in numerical order.

Mr. Eidelson – his correspondence included suggestions on the format of the Goals and Objectives of Chapter 2 of the Master Plan. Currently each type of development has Goals and Objectives, followed by the planning issue narrative. Alternatively, the listing of all of the Goals and Objectives could be the first half of the chapter, followed by a second half containing the narrative. This format would allow anyone reading the Plan to have all of the Goals and Objectives in a one location format. The consensus was to keep the existing format.

Mr. Eidelson - As written, the Plan has a relatively significant amount of detail in the actual Objectives, and suggested that as an alternative the same Objectives could be written with less detail while still maintaining the essence of the expressed purpose. Several drafting examples

were included in the correspondence. The consensus was to re-write the Objectives in a more concise manner.

Revision Issue F – Suburban Residential Area (SRA) Boundary. Currently the designated SRAs are near the City of Mason and along the major roads coming out on the east side of Mason. Mr. Eidelson provided 2 maps at the meeting: the most current plat map, indicating parcels of land in the Township; and a larger map including the current SRA boundary map in the Master Plan.

Mr. Eidelson – explained in his correspondence (quoted/edited below):

- The boundary to the east of Mason correlates to an expansive wetlands/hydric soils corridor running generally north and south. This corridor was the basis used in 2004 for a natural boundary for the SRA.
- The current SRA boundary purposely extends along M-36 and Dexter Trail Road, to benefit from the improved infrastructure and condition of these principal thoroughfares. These are important considerations when addressing higher intensity land uses.
- The current SRA boundary was based on, in part, interest in ensuring a reasonable “bank” of developable land to more effectively encourage transfer of development rights (TDR) opportunities in association with farmland preservation in the “Agricultural/Rural Residential Area.”
- The current SRA covers approximately 3,400 acres and includes land that is largely undevelopable due to wetlands, the existing developed status of the land, and existing road right-of-way acreage. The actual developable acreage is about 2,200 acres. Based on an average development density of one dwelling per one acre, and allowing for public road right-of-ways, drainage facilities and general inefficiencies in neighborhood design, the approximate total dwelling unit build-out in the current SRA is about 1,700 dwellings. For reference/context purposes, there are approximately 1,410 dwelling units in the township today, approximately 3,500 residents, and (using the same methodology as above) the dwelling build-out for the current “Agricultural / Rural Residential Area” is approximately 4,400 dwellings.

Mr. Eidelson – the Commission had asked about new boundaries being roughly within one half mile of the City of Mason. His second map superimposed these potential boundaries on the SRA. This would result in a smaller SRA that covers approximately 2,200 acres and (using the methodology previously described) provides for an approximate build-out of 1,000 dwellings.

COMMISSION – discussed:

- The west side of the City of Mason is largely comprised of a relatively few parcels with a high value of agricultural use, versus the relatively denser development on the east side. These west side parcels within a half mile of the City are deserving of protection, as the current SRA boundary does.
- The Township has lost population over the past twenty years, including an estimated 30 residents between 2010 and 2013. The Commission asked for population projections, which Mr. Eidelson expects to have by next week. He cautioned that projections are just that, and not necessarily accurate.
- Discussion on the location of larger agricultural parcels in the Township, platting by right anywhere in the Township, change in population/development pressure, and TDRs having been a significant possibility back in 2004 when the SRA boundaries were decided.

COMMISSION – There was a majority support for the half mile concept, depending on existing development, natural features, etc. On the west side of the City of Mason, keep the lines of the current SRA boundary that protect the large parcels currently used for agricultural purposes. Mr. Eidelson was asked to adjust the SRA boundaries accordingly.

Revision Issue G – the Chapter Three “Industrial Area” does not recognize the commercial development along Kipp Road in the general vicinity of the airport and the commercial rezonings adopted in 2009. Mr. Eidelson’s correspondence suggested four alternatives to resolving this situation (quoted/edited below):

1. Discourage all non-industrial uses except those parcels along Kipp Road already being used for non-industrial purposes and generally within the scope of the B-1 and/or B-2 Districts, with no expansion to adjacent parcels.
2. Permit commercial uses along Kipp Road, from the City of Mason east to Dexter Trail, generally within the scope of the B-1 and/or B-2 Districts, but limited to a depth of approximately 300’ from the Kipp Road right-of-way (frontage acreage only).
3. Permit commercial uses along Kipp Road, from the City of Mason east to Dexter Trail (as in #2 above). Limit commercial uses to those principally of a non-retail/office nature, such as vehicle/equipment sales and service, truck terminals, motels/hotels, and service stations. This option would likely require the development of a new commercial district with a more limited scope of authorized uses.
4. Permit commercial uses along Kipp Road, from the City of Mason east to Dexter Trail (as in #2 and #3 above), but without any limitations on the scope of commercial uses except as provided by the B-1 and/or B-2 Districts.

COMMISSION – discussed:

- Jewett airport and possible future uses as an airport or otherwise. There has been talk of a community college beginning associated operations.
- The siting of, and complications of, allowing commercial uses along Kipp Road north of the runways. Any such use would need to be regulated by zoning to clarify specific use issues.
- The existence of the non-industrial baseball practice use and the growth of B-2 Highway Service uses in the area.
- Re-naming the area as “Industrial/Highway Service” to reflect the apparent trend of development, and to encourage any future B-2 use to be close to the US 127/Kipp Road interchange.

COMMISSION – asked Mr. Eidelson to re-name the area along the lines of “Industrial/Highway Service” and to draft narrative allowing for non-industrial uses considered compatible with those named uses.

Revision Issue H – The Chapter Three “Kipp Road Mixed-Use Area” does not provide beneficial clarity regarding the suggested scope of appropriate commercial uses and is not clear on the role of residential development.

COMMISSION - discussed:

- The current essentially agricultural and low density residential nature of the area, and what mixed uses would be appropriate.

- The nature of fast food and other types of restaurants and whether or not they would be desirable in this area.
- Whether this area is appropriate for B-2 Highway Service uses.
- The meaning of “discourage” and “encourage” as used in the Master Plan, and how that would affect not only future use of this area but also similar proposed development in the rest of the Township, especially along the roads leading into Mason or onto US 127.
- The use of site plans to minimize impacts, such as lighting, parking expanses, traffic flow, etc.
- The use of SLU permits to encourage or discourage certain types of development, such as “Big Box” stores. There was a divide on the Commission between distinctly discouraging such operations, and focusing on this US 127 interchange to allow placement of such an operation immediately adjacent to the highway.
- Property assessments of certain commercial uses. In the past several years the state Tax Tribunal and the courts have been lowering such assessments for various reasons.
- Reducing the total area for mixed use. Several configurations were discussed.
- Encouraging any high density residential development to be located here as opposed to out in the more agricultural portions of the Township.

COMMISSION - Mr. Eidelson was asked to revise the boundary of this area to roughly the NE quarter portion of Section 17.

While the Commission had spent well over another 3 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.

2) Master Plan

Incorporated into the above discussion.

3) Zoning Ordinance and Map dated 8-21-2015

Incorporated into the above discussion.

B. Set Next Meeting Date for Master Plan Deliberations

Mr. Eidelson has discussed with the Commission all previously identified issues. All of the issues he sees as additionally needing to be addressed have been discussed in the past few meetings. Seeing no need for additional special meetings, none were scheduled.

VI. Any Other Business

Chair Thayer – Noted:

- The R-M1 parcels in Section 17 were conditionally zoned, the time frame for development to meet that zoning has expired, and a public hearing needs to be held to allow the zoning to revert to Agricultural.
- The Zoning Ordinance needs to address site condominium plans. Language should mirror provisions governing subdivisions.

- The by-laws for the Commission are outdated. She recommended discussion of new by-laws at the next regular meeting.

VII. Additional Public Comment

There was no additional public comment.

VIII. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

John Lazet, Secretary