

**WILLIAMSTOWN TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
July 19th, 2011**

CALL TO ORDER

The Williamstown Township Planning Commission convened at 7:30 pm at the Williamstown Township Hall located at 4990 Zimmer Road, Williamston, Michigan. Chairman Michael Fielek called the meeting to order and reviewed the agenda.

PRESENT: Chairman Mike Fielek, Vice Chair LaMore, Secretary Gerald Eidt, Commissioners Dali Giese, Rod Imhoff, Ger Schultink and Board Representative Martin Wright.

ABSENT: Commissioners Ron Cook and Joscelyn Brown-Timm

ALSO PRESENT: Planning Consultant Chris Doozan of McKenna Associates and Planning Assistant Wanda Bloomquist

MINUTES APPROVAL

Motion by Commissioner Schultink to approve the June 21st, 2011 minutes.

Seconded by Secretary Eidt

Motion Carries

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

Closed at 7:33 pm

New Business

Shannon Shared Driveway

Chris reviewed the proposal for the two parcels.

Shoesmith Rd parcel of 51.5 acres is referred to as Parcel A and preserves a rectangular parcel .

The zoning ordinance allows the PC to waive the frontage requirement provided:

1. The proposal would maintain the Township's rural character and image by allowing houses in locations where they are fully or substantially screened from view from the public road.
2. The proposal would allow development on the parts of the parent parcel that are best suited.
3. The proposal would allow development that is compatible with surrounding land use.

McKenna's greatest concern is with no. 1. Would prefer a smaller lot to allow more buffers.

The land division cannot be approved without all of the information required by the ordinance.

Haslett Rd parcel of 94 acres is referred to as Parcel B.

The above also applies to this parcel. McKenna felt that the applicant could be more creative in wrapping the lots around the wetlands in the SW corner of the property and provide a buffer area.

Applicant explained reason for asking approval for the shared drive option w/o the road frontage.

Discussion:

- Permitted number of splits: as shown
- Adjacent to each other
- Discussed the original lot split for the farm dwelling and the possibility of purchasing more land.
- Rezoning would permit more splits- deeded in perpetuity.
- Parcel A: leave along road- would like to exercise 5 acres for marketability.
- Unimaginative design

- W/o waiver can line lots along the frontage.
- Curve around wetland would be more creative
- Wetlands can be used for pasture
- 120' road frontage option doesn't create a nice lot
- Trying to work within the Master Plan
- Can approval be made conditional?
- Voluntary option- shared drive is reason before PC
- These splits would hurt county preservation criteria
- May create a blind driveway
- Conservation Easement
- Other options may be available to split
- Rare and unique is what is marketability
- 102 tillable on both parcels
- Been for sale-no offers to date
- Price asking for land: \$6000 an acre.
- Consult with Meridian regarding Shared Drive
- Do what is permitted
- 6.01 discusses number of splits allowed
- Will forward info from ordinance to applicant for further review
- Approve concept with provision: either development rights sold to county or placed in preservation.
- Applicant could come back after county approval of development rights purchase.

Commissioner Schultink moved that the Planning Commission approve the concept of the lot splits as presented provided the remainder of the land be subject to sale of development rights to the county or is placed in an agricultural preservation trust or conservation easement with the added points 2-7 in the letter dated July 14, 2011 from Chris Doozan being met.

Support by Trustee Wright

Discussion:

- This gives applicant options to go forward with the county, transfer of development rights or do what is permitted in the ordinance.
- For both parcels A and B
- Two options of ag preservation or open space
- Loses option to place a house if goes with Township Option.
- Clarifying remainder of land would be in trust-no building site.
- Interpretation of agriculture
- Time frame to sell development rights.
- No expiration date.
- Minus buildable space on parent parcel.

Ayes: 3 Nays: 4

Motion fails.

Litchfield Site Plan Modifications

Chris Doozan reviewed July 11th letter addressing the original submission. He furthered reviewed the recent letter from applicant and revised site plan submitted to Chris this evening.

Issues reviewed:

- Fencing depends on use of site.
- Loading dock wish to eliminate dock-address landscaping
- Reviewed points in letter

- Recent letter addresses dumpster pad.
- Variance required for gravel parking approval
- Proposed fencing further back. Revised plan does not show any fencing
- Ordinance requires paving. Paving can handle truck traffic.

Discussion:

- Main issue is paving. Crushed asphalt is already there. Why not leave. Parking spaces need to be paved per ordinance.
- ZBA action needed to waive paving.
- Fencing would shield landscaping business.
- The sale of the property is not relevant to the modification to the site plan.
- Could approve without the fence.
- Dumpster size meets ordinance requirements
- Paving would not require ZBA approval

**Vice- Chair LaMore recommended approval of the revised site plan received on 7/12 with the applicant’s revisions. PC notes that the sidewalk along the north face of the building is not concrete. Supported by Commissioner Schultink.
Motion Carries**

Unfinished Business

Ordinance Review

Chris Doozan presented Article 8 through Article 17.

Discussion over corrections needed:

Page 8-11: remove 8(b)

5. Manner to conform to GAAMPS remove second paragraph
d. removed RE

Page 8-25: b. follow state and federal regulations

Page 8-40: Location for wineries: and or AG-C district

Page 8-43: 6. Change paft to part

Page 11-2: remove public or private colleges

Page 14-3: correction of lot width- rear setback and building coverage.

Motion by Commissioner Imhoff to submit to the board for approval Article 8 through Article 17 with the above amendments.

Support by Secretary Eidt

Motion carries

Discussion: none

(Duly noted that there is a need for a PH prior to Board review and action)

Master Plan Review

The recommendation of items for review was supported by Board. An estimated cost for review will be provided by the consultant.

Suggested asking for board support to do a survey similar to survey monkey.

If the Township mailed a survey with tax payment, next bill would be in December.

Open letter in the newsletter for residents to go to website and take survey might promote participation .

Issues: non-residents participating and being able to take the survey more than once – ask for address or parcel number.

Planning and Board Reports and Review

Township Board

- August meeting pushed to second Tuesday.
- May get an emergency siren- county determines site
- Resolution from the board to address Auctions as we review the ordinance

Planning Staff

- Parks and Rec committee is reviewing the parks ordinance.

Review

- Review Articles 19-22 for next meeting. Chris will bring updates from past review. Further suggestions to Wanda by August 2nd.

Public Comment

Larry Harb - Okemos: regarding the issue of auctions in the township.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Commissioner Imhoff to adjourn the meeting.
Meeting adjourned at 10:05 pm.

Wanda Bloomquist
Recording Secretary

Gerald A. Eidt, Secretary