

VEVAY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
Special Meeting
Wednesday, April 20, 2016
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 Consultant 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. Reports

There were no reports for consideration or discussion.

VI. Pending Business

A. Site Plan Review Request from Mid-MI Snow Equipment, 890 Eden Road

Jim Byrum, on behalf of Mid-Michigan Snow Equipment – the firm is looking to build a storage building to the north of the existing paved area. Paving would only be for maneuvering and access to the three vehicle entrance doors on the western end of the building. The current driveway has cracks, which will be milled and re-surfaced. Much of the expected traffic would be late in the evening when business concludes. Consumers Energy hasn't yet decided how the utility service to the building will work. The dumpster will stay in the building except on pick-up day. Outside LED lighting will be only for the building itself, only on the south side, not for the parking lot, and on from dusk to dawn, as the current building has. They will be moving two maple trees, and will be adding on the north side 6-8 trees in a staggered line for screening. There will be a grouping of weeping cedars on the NE corner of the new building.

Comm. Cady – raised a question as to lot coverage for accessory buildings, and whether the Ordinance requirements conflict with the proposal. COMMISSION – discussed Sec. 3.09 (Accessory Buildings and Structures), Sec. 2.02 (“Accessory Building” definition), and Sec. 2.14 (“Main Building” definition”). The Commission concluded that the proposed use of the new building is not an accessory use but an expansion of the main use, and as such, the limitations do not apply.

The submitted site plan was a four-page diagrammatic depiction of the proposed building and the overall parcel, including the information required by the ordinance. The Commission considered the submitted site plan, asked questions of the applicant, discussed the site plan review performed by AGS, and made the following findings:

Section 14.03 – Site Plan Review Requirements:

- A general location sketch showing at minimum, properties, streets and use of land within 1/2 mile of the area. – An aerial view map was provided which indicated the surrounding parcels and structures.
- Legal description of the subject property. – Provided in the application.
- The date, north arrow, and scale. – Provided, including the date of the revisions.
- Name and address of the property owner or petitioner. – Provided in the application.
- Name and address of the person and/or firm who drafted the plan and the date on which the plan was prepared. – Provided in the application.
- Existing zoning and use of all properties abutting the subject property. - Provided in the aerial map.
- All buildings, parking and driveways within 100 feet of all property lines. – Provided in the aerial view map.
- The overall objectives of the proposed development. – Provided in the site plan. The applicant indicated that the overall purpose is to increase vehicle and parts storage area to accommodate their business needs.
- Size (in acres) of the subject property and approximate number of acres allocated to size
- (in acres) of the subject property and approximate number of acres allocated to each proposed use and gross area in building, structures, parking, public streets and drives, and open space. – The applicant indicated the parcel is 7.228 acres in size. All other dimensions were indicated on the site plan.
- Dwelling unit densities by type, if applicable. – Not applicable.
- Proposed method of providing sewer and water service, as well as other public and private utilities. – Not applicable.
- Proposed method of providing storm drainage. – Not applicable; already provided on site.
- Seal, name, and firm address of the professional individual responsible for the preparation of the site plan. - Provided in the site plan.
- Property lines and required setbacks shown and dimensioned. - Provided in the site plan.
- Dimensions of all existing and proposed structures on the subject property including dwelling unit densities by type, if applicable. – Provided in the site plan.
- Size and location of existing and proposed utilities, including any proposed connections to public, or private community sewer or water supply systems. – the only utility to be added is electricity, and Consumers Energy has not yet decided how they will provide service.
- All existing and proposed drives (including dimensions and radii), acceleration/deceleration lanes, sidewalks, signs, exterior lighting, curbing, parking areas (including the dimensions of

a typical parking space and the total number of parking spaces to be provided), fire lanes, and unloading areas. For projects on a collector or arterial road, see also Section 12.04. – All but parking indicated in the site plan; parking is not restricted to any portion of the paved area.

- Pavement width and right-of-way width of all roads, streets, and access easements within 100 feet of the subject property. – As all of these are standard county roads, the dimensions are standard for two-lane roads throughout the Township. Not applicable.
- Location and size of all surface water drainage facilities. – After discussion, determined to not be applicable.
- Location of all solid waste disposal facilities, including recycling, and screening. – Not applicable, as the applicants noted that all of these operations will happen inside the buildings.
- Location and specifications for existing or proposed outside, above or below ground storage facilities for hazardous materials. – Not applicable.
- All existing vegetation and the location, type, and size of all proposed landscaping, and the location, height and type of existing and proposed fences and walls. - Included in the site plan.
- Recreation areas, common use areas, flood plain areas and areas to be conveyed for public use and purpose. – Not applicable.
- Exterior lighting showing area of illumination and indicating the type and height of fixture to be used. – Included in the site plan.
- Elevation drawings of proposed buildings. Included in the site plan.

D. Additional Information

Given the submission of a revised site plan and materials, no additional graphics or written materials were requested. COMMISSION – had discussion on possible traffic impacts, and as the current use and traffic are currently being conducted, there is no significant foreseeable increase in traffic. No Traffic Impact Assessment or Traffic Impact Study was required of the applicant.

Section 14.04 – Application and Review: It was noted that all required copies and fees have been submitted.

Section 14.06– Review Standards: the Commission made the following findings:

B. Site Development Standards

1. As the use is not changing and has no negative impact on the surrounding industrial, farming, and commercial operations, the Commission determined that the proposed use would not adversely affect the public health, safety, or welfare. The proposed addition of more trees would help the property in retaining the “rural” nature of the Township.
2. Though there will be more traffic, it should not be significant enough to impede the normal and orderly development or improvement of surrounding properties.
3. The existing vegetation plus the proposed addition of several trees was found to provide reasonable visual and sound privacy for nearby dwelling units.
4. As there is only one nearby dwelling, no public parking, no sidewalks and no commercial activities planned or adjacent to the parcel, a “pedestrian paced atmosphere” was not deemed to be applicable.
5. Necessary emergency vehicle access is already available via the existing driveway and parking lot areas.

6. Exterior lighting was discussed in some detail. The existing exterior lights on the existing building have been there since construction, and there have been no complaints. The lights on the proposed new building will be on the south side only, shielded and aimed downward, and for lighting the building only, not the parking lot.
7. The loading and unloading operations are proposed between existing trees and vegetation. No outside storage is being proposed. Screening was found to be adequate.
8. At this time, no other governmental agency approvals are known to be required.
9. As the existing use has been there for many years and no new uses are proposed, the spirit of the Zoning Ordinance and the Master Plan are considered to have been met.

C. Vehicular and Pedestrian Standards

1. As the site will be limited to traffic of the firm's vehicle fleet, as there is no pedestrian traffic, and as the property has already long been used for the proposed use, "safe, convenient, uncongested and well-defined vehicular and pedestrian circulation" are considered to be already adequately provided.
2. The existing driveway connections to Eden and Tomlinson Road were found to be adequate to provide for a safe and efficient circulation system.
3. Consideration of access points to public roads was discussed as to safety, efficiency, and impacts on surrounding parcels. Given the pre-existing lay-out and the proposed level of traffic, this requirement was deemed to be sufficiently provided.
4. Given the limited number of vehicles provided access to the property, adequate traffic control was discussed and deemed to not need any improvement.
5. The possibility of the need for sidewalks in the foreseeable future is remote. There are no sidewalks currently on the property or surrounding parcels and none are planned. No known trails or pathways for the general public are needed, given the district and the proposed uses.
6. No shared driveways are needed.

D. Environmental and Natural Features Standards

1. No removal or alteration of significant natural features is proposed or needed. The proposed addition of vegetative screening was deemed adequate to buffer the proposed expansion from surrounding public and private property.
2. No landmark trees or significant vegetation require protection during the transition to the proposed use.
3. On site drainage was discussed at several points during the meeting, and given the "sheet drainage" based on the topography and surfaces, no additional measures were deemed to be required. There is no known history nor recent experience of standing water on the property after rainfall. Drainage was deemed to be adequate and to not negatively impact any public storm drainage system.
4. The collection of surface water so as to not impede traffic was considered to be not applicable to this proposed use. No subsurface landscape islands or catch basins are needed for drainage purposes..
5. Natural drainage patterns will be retained, and are not known to negatively impact neighboring properties or public storm drainage systems.
6. The only natural drainage feature is the onsite pond, which is not affected by the proposed development. As the property and use have been unchanged for many years, this standard of review was deemed to not be applicable.

7. Given the small parcel size and current drainage patterns, retention of stormwater on-site was not considered to be practical or necessary.

SECTION 15.04 LIGHTING – the Commission made the following findings:

1. The proposal includes wall-mounted pack lighting for the building only and not the parking lot. This should prevent unnecessary glare and sky glow which could negatively affect rural character.
2. As required, the lights will be directed downward, and to only light the building itself.
3. As there is no activity at night, no parking lot lighting is proposed; the Commission approved lighting for just the building, for security purposes.
4. The proposed new lights will be mounted at 14 feet, well below the 30 foot height restriction.
5. No canopy lighting is proposed, and this requirement is not applicable.
6. As no canopy is proposed, this requirement is not applicable.

SECTION 15.05 LANDSCAPING REQUIREMENTS

Commission findings were based on the stated intent of the Ordinance, to: conserve the value of land and buildings; maintain an attractive property; blend harmonious land uses, buffer incompatible land uses, and define outdoor and architectural spaces; control soil erosion by slowing or constraining the effects of wind or water; minimize the transmission from one land use to another of nuisances associated with noise, dust and glare; distinguish and separate vehicular and pedestrian traffic system; minimize negative visual impact; establish a greater sense of privacy from visual or physical intrusion of intense land uses, the degree of privacy varying with the intensity of the screening; and safeguard the public health, safety and welfare, and preserve the aesthetic qualities and enhance rural character.

The site already has a significant number of larger trees and vegetation that shield and mitigate the view of the existing building and operations. Two relatively mature maple trees will be moved so as to continue to provide a screen. Six to eight larger trees will be added on the north property line in a staggered pattern to supplement the existing vegetative screen. All trees and vegetation are of permitted species, and the existing, acceptable maintenance schedule of the property will continue.

The Commission determined that the revised site plan adequately includes:

1. General Requirements
 - a. All applicable information listed in Chapter 14
 - b. All applicable information listed in Section 15 pertaining to plant materials.
 - c. The location, general size, and type of existing vegetation to be retained.
 - d. A planting schedule was deemed to be inapplicable, given the existing screening on site.
2. Required plant materials
All trees are and will be maples and pines, which are permitted species. Ground vegetation, including weeping cedars, meets Ordinance requirements.
3. Trees Not Permitted
All existing and proposed trees meet the requirements of the Ordinance.
4. Mixing of Species
Species are and will be adequately mixed and spaced.

5. Species selection
Maple and pine trees, weeping cedars, and proposed ground cover are adequate.
 6. Plant material spacing
Existing screening is appropriate. The addition of more trees on the north property line is a valued addition.
 7. Installation
Not applicable.
 8. Maintenance
Given the species utilized, maintenance should be minimal, and has been adequate to date.
 9. Existing vegetation
Existing vegetation, especially trees, will be protected during construction. The two trees that are in the proposed footprint of the building will be spaded and moved.
- D. Landscape Buffer Zones
Not applicable.
- E. Parking Lot Landscaping
Not applicable.
- F. Site Landscaping
The one applicable requirement of this subsection is (2)(f), requiring plantings to break up long expanses of building without windows. The proposal is for clerestory windows along the entire north and south walls, the two long walls. Between the existing screening, the proposed additional trees on the northern side, and vegetation along the northeastern corner of the building, the screening was deemed to be adequate.
- G. Detention and Retention Ponds
Not applicable.
- H. Utility Buildings, Outdoor Equipment, Outdoor Storage, and Waste Receptacles
Not applicable.

The Commission, having considered the site plan and having made the findings as detailed above:

MOTION Cady, seconded by Uzzle, that the revised site plan for warehouse operations on parcel #33-10-10-16-400-020, 980 S. Eden Road, as submitted by Mid-Michigan Snow Equipment (signed by Tim W. Russell), March 28, 2016, and revised April 8, 2016, be approved as it meets the requirements of Chapters 14 and 15 of the Zoning Ordinance as determined by the Commission as reflected in the meeting minutes above.

CARRIED 7-0.

COMMISSION – discussed: with Supervisor Ramey the complications in the application process; perhaps clarifying the standards to applicants when a site plan is required; how best for applicants and the Township to discuss the adequacy of a proposed site plan and when it is complete; the importance of having a clear record of what was discussed; how to have a more “user-friendly” approach; and requested Supervisor Ramey to ask AGS for their interpretation of “accessory building”.

I. Master Plan

Mr. Eidelson – has gone through all of the revisions noted in the minutes. He had questions about several of the edits, which were resolved with Commission input, including correcting some of the notes in the preliminary April 6 meeting minutes.

Traffic counts: the Ingham County Road Department conducts these infrequently; the most up to date counts are in the draft. Census data is from the 2013 census estimates. No groundwater recharge maps are available that would be useful, as no geographic areas can be designated. Page C-3: the county estimates go through 2045, while table is only every 10 years. The dates in Table C-2 reflect the same trends though with different years. Maps: the different purposes of the maps were discussed as well as the different criteria, depending on the purpose. Some clarification of text on the maps will be provided.

Other changes include:

- 1-4: Change the last sentence to along the lines of – “This growth area is to provide opportunities for comparably higher density living arrangements than provided elsewhere in the township, provided adequate ~~measures are available for~~ potable water and sewage disposal ARE PROVIDED.”.
- 1-5: right column, second paragraph, change the sentence to “The most visible signs of industrial activity are the gravel ~~extraction~~ PAVING AND EXCAVATION operations south of Mason...”, and later in the paragraph, “Excluding gravel ~~extraction~~ PAVING AND EXCAVATION OPERATIONS...”.
- 1-5 – third paragraph, last sentence, “SSAB” should be “GESTAMP”.
- 4-4: right column, last paragraph, change the last sentence to read “Use of this right-of-way, AS AVAILABLE, as a trail system, would be a ...”.
- 4-5: left column, second paragraph, starting with the second sentence, “As the Township’s only recreational facility at this time and centrally located, commitment to its maintenance and improvement is essential. ~~including the development of a long range master plan for the facility based upon an analysis of existing conditions in the park and the inclusion of those~~ Recreation improvements SHOULD REFLECT ~~that~~ WHAT the community-at-large places most emphasis upon.”.
- 5-4: Chart –
 - In row R-1A, under Primary Relationship, leave “suburban”, and in Row 1-B, change “rural” to “suburban”.
 - Strike row “R-3” in its entirety and include in the introductory paragraph language indicating that more intensive residential growth may be considered in the future.
 - In the “Primary Intended District Use” column of R-MF, strike “Two-family dwellings and”.
 - Correct the spelling of “concrete” in the bottom right box.
- 5-5: second paragraph at the top, second line, add a colon after “such as” and letter the named exceptions.
- 5-5: Chart –
 - Strike row “R-3” in its entirety and include in the introductory paragraph language indicating that more intensive residential growth may be considered in the future.

Mr. Eidelson - will check with the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission on available maps, make the revisions, and aim for about the beginning of June to have the second draft

available. He would recommend a careful review of that draft, and if no revisions are necessary, the Commission would then forward the Plan to the Board for distribution.

COMMISSION – discussed the conditionally re-zoned parcel on Jewett Road just north of Tomlinson Road, and asked Supervisor Ramey to find out legally how the parcel would revert to its prior zoning, as the conditions were not met.

C. Discussion/Scheduling of May Special Meeting for ZO Sign Ordinance Amendment

Depending on Legal Counsel’s availability, the Chair will schedule a special meeting for May 11 or May 18, 2016. The meeting will include a Public Hearing on the proposed amendments.

VII. Any Other Business

Throughout the evening the Commissioners noted various provisions of the Ordinance that may need further review in light of application and interpretation issues. Topics and Ordinance sections for starting points include:

- a better definition of “main building” (Sec. 2.14)
- accessory buildings and their connection to a main building (Sec. 2.02 and 2.14)
- Accessory buildings and square footage for lot coverage (Sec. 2.13, 5.03, 6.03 and 8.03)
- Citations: In Sec. 14.03, the Final Site Plan Requirements cite Sec. 12.04, which is non-existent.
- The 50’ setback for fences (Sec. 3.25(C))
- How to retire SLUs
- Reviewing other options for site plan and SLU reviews
- Whether the “M-1” designation for zoning should be changed to “I-1” to better reflect uses

VIII. Additional Public Comment

There was no additional public comment.

IX. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:11 p.m.

John Lazet, Secretary