

VEVAY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
Special Meeting
Tuesday, October 4, 2016
Vevay Township Hall – 6:00 p.m.

MINUTES

Members present: Jack Cady, Richard Lacasse, John Lazet, Pattie McNeilly, Jim Minster, Ilene Thayer, and Bruce Walker.

Members absent: None.

Other Persons present: Supervisor Jesse Ramey.

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 submitted.

IV. Brief Public Comment

Chair Thayer introduced Jim Minster, who was recently appointed to the Commission to replace Wayne Uzzle.

V. Pending Business

A. Discussion on Possible Zoning Ordinance Amendments

Comm. Lazet – recommended adding marijuana provisioning centers to the list of items for discussion based on recently enacted state law. Chair Thayer encouraged members who had other issues for consideration to submit those items in writing.

Chair Thayer – explained that while there is no schedule as such, the goal is to go through the list and develop reasonable recommendations for amendments in a timely manner.

CHAPTER 3 – GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 3.02 – Technical - second line, add a comma after “state”.

Sec. 3.06 - Shared Driveway – the issue is that the township does not allow for private roads, but shared driveways in essence operate as such. For instance, in Section 17 of the Township, there are two landlocked parcels that abut US 127 but have no access to Jewett Road. There is potentially a proposal to subdivide these lots, with proposed access by shared driveways. COMMISSION – had discussion on setbacks, standards for access by first responders, and road

bed quality of shared driveways. PRELIMINARY SUGGESTION - In Sec. 3.06 (A), remove the reference to shared driveways, by inserting a period after “road” and deleting the rest of the sentence. In Sec. 3.06 (C), after “driveway”, delete the phrase “in the Access Management Overlay District”.

Sec. 3.08 - Home Occupations – the issue is what level of permitting and review is appropriate. COMMISSION – had discussion on what level of activity would reach the thresh hold of needing a SLU permit versus a new, lesser review for a home occupation permit. An SLU permit could be required where the proposed operation would entail significant noise, such as certain types of woodworking or a dog kennel, or the operation would generate significant traffic, such as a multiple and possibly simultaneous customer business like tax preparation. Operations such as a beauty salon, with minimal impacts, would possibly not need a SLU permit. PRELIMINARY SUGGESTION – Amend:

- The first sentence along the lines of “UNLESS THE PROPOSED OPERATIONS ARE SUBJECT TO THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 16.06, persons wishing to establish a home occupation must first obtain a ~~Special Land Use~~ HOME OCCUPATION permit. ~~In addition to the provisions of Section 16.02, Administrative and Review Procedures,~~ The following standards will be applied for each HOME OCCUPATION permit:”.
- Add a new subsection (H), along the lines of: “IF THE OPERATIONS OF THE HOME OCCUPATION DO NOT COMPLY WITH ALL OF THE ABOVE STANDARDS, THE PERMIT IS SUBJECT TO REVOCATION PURSUANT TO THE PROCESS DETAILED IN SECTION 16.05.”.
- Where appropriate in this section, add along the lines of the following: “A SITE PLAN FOR A HOME OCCUPATION PERMIT IS NOT SUBJECT TO THE PROVISIONS OF SEC. 14.06 (B) – SITE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS, SEC. 14.06 (D) – ENVIRONMENTAL AND NATURAL FEATURES STANDARDS, AND SEC. 15.05 – LANDSCAPING REQUIREMENTS.”.

Sec. 3.09 (E) – Accessory Buildings – the issue is the restriction on the number and total square footage. COMMISSION – some residents have wanted to have more buildings or larger buildings, but have been constrained by these limits. Given the acreage, the allowable building size could be increased. PRELIMINARY SUGGESTION – In the table in subsection (E):

- In the column Total Number of Buildings, “Over 3 acres – 5 acres”, allow for three buildings.
- In the column Square Footage of all Accessory Buildings, change
 - “Over 1 acre – 3 acres” from 1,600 to 2,000;
 - “Over 3 acres – 5 acres” from 2,400 to 3,200;
 - “Over 5 acres” from 800 to 1,000 *sq. ft. per acre*. Revised 11-9-16

Section 3.25 – Fencing for animal keeping – the issue is that requiring a 50 foot setback while only requiring 200 foot of road frontage potentially places half of a parcel off-limits for animal keeping. COMMISSION - discussion on various types of non-commercial animal keeping operations, non-application of GAAMPS, and various negative impacts on surrounding parcels that the setback was meant to address. PRELIMINARY SUGGESTION - Subsection (C), change the 50 foot fence setback to 25 foot.

Sec. 3.27 (A) (4) (b) (1) – Technical - second line, amend along the lines of “...150’ from the lot line to which ~~the~~ THE PANELS generally ~~faces~~ FACE.”

CHAPTER 5 – AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT

Sec. 5.02 – Add to the Table of Uses, within Non-Residential: “LARGE SOLAR ENERGY SYSTEMS – SLU”.

CHAPTER 7 – MANUFACTURED HOME COMMUNITY DISTRICT

Sec. 7.03 (A) – The issue is requiring setbacks for individual units, when that provision is governed by state law. PRELIMINARY SUGGESTION - In the “Minimum Setbacks” section of the table, amend to:

Front Yard – 50 ft. for the Community, ~~10 ft. for individual sites~~

Side Yard – 50 ft. for the Community, ~~10 each side for individual sites~~

Rear Yard – 50 ft. for the Community, ~~15 ft. for individual sites~~

CHAPTER 9 – M-1 – INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT

Sec. 9.02 – Add to the Table of Uses “LARGE SOLAR ENERGY SYSTEMS – SLU”.

CHAPTER 16 – SPECIAL LAND USES

Sec. 16.05 – The issue is how to cancel a SLU permit where the operation no longer occurs and the owner is willing to surrender the permit. COMMISSION – discussed how revocation is at the initiation of the Township, while surrendering a permit needs to be by action of the permit holder. PRELIMINARY SUGGESTION – Amend the title of the section to “Revocation AND SURRENDER of Special Land Use”

- Have the current language become Subsection “A”;
- Add a new subsection “B” along the lines of: “UPON WRITTEN REQUEST OF THE SLU PERMIT HOLDER(S), THE TOWNSHIP BOARD MAY ACCEPT THE SURRENDER OF ANY SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT. ACCEPTANCE BY THE TOWNSHIP SHALL BE BY A VOTE OF THE BOARD OR TRUSTEES AT A PUBLIC MEETING.” Comm. Lacasse offered to recommend language he has seen in his experience as an administrative law judge, and Supervisor Ramey offered to talk with legal counsel about how best to phrase language for cancellation.

Sec. 16.06 – Technical:

- Subsection 16.06 (I) (1) (b) - correct the lettering to eliminate the duplicate “iv”.
- Subsection 16.06 (I) – after (9), by re-numbering the subsections as there is no (10).

Sec. 16.06 (Q) (7) – The issue is the allowable size of an equine enclosed riding arena. COMMISSION – discussed the variable size allowed dependent on the acreage, and what the industry standard or practice might be as to size. Comm. Lacasse offered to do more research on this matter.

GENERAL PROVISION THROUGHOUT THE ORDINANCE

All of the Tables of Uses in all of the districts will need to have added “Church - P” as federal law allows the location of such facilities in every district of the Township, though certain zoning regulations still apply.

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 8:50 p.m.

John Lazet, Secretary