

LAPEER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSON
Lapeer Township Hall and Community Building
Monday February 16, 2009
Regular Meeting
7:30 pm

PRESENT: Chairman Tim Roodvoets, Vice-Chairman Kenneth Ewing, Secretary Ruth Lendt, Commissioner Phillip Thick, Commissioner Fred Green and Commissioner Deborah Cady.

ABSENT: Commissioner John Rutzen, excused.

OTHERS

PRESENT: Christopher McLeod of Community Planning & Management, P.C.,
Lapeer Township Planning Consultant
Leonard Lumley, 1031 Pinetree Lane, Lapeer Township
Patti Kooy, 3044 Wynns Mill Pt. Metamora, representing Christ the King Lutheran Church
Pastor Nick Schillack, Christ the King Lutheran Church
Mike Carpenter of Rowe Engineering representing Christ the King Lutheran Church
Dawn Walker, Lapeer Township Clerk

Chairman Roodvoets called meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Roll call followed, a quorum was present.

APPROVAL
OF MINUTES:

The January 19, 2009 regular meeting minutes and the February 2, 2009 study session meeting minutes were presented for approval.

MOVED by Commissioner Thick, support by Commissioner Cady to approve the January 19, 2009 regular meeting minutes and the February 2, 2009 study session meeting minutes. A vote was taken, Ayes: All (6).
MOTION CARRIED.

PUBLIC TIME:

Chairman Roodvoets opened the meeting for public time.

No one appeared wishing to address the Planning Commission during public time.

OLD BUSINESS:

CHRIST THE KING
LUTHERAN CHURCH
SLU #2009-001:

Christ the King Lutheran Church, Special Land Use #2009-001

Planner McLeod addressed the Commissioners and reviewed Community Planning & Management's comments dated February 9, 2009. All concerns have been addressed with the exception of the site lighting plan. Planner has no objections.

Upon the request of Chairman Roodvoets, Clerk Walker stated that Engineer Cory Mabery's comments are presented for Commissioners to review stating his recommendation for engineering approval of the

preliminary site plan. More detailed plans are required for the engineering review phase of the project.

Mike Carpenter of Rowe Engineering stated that the lighting has been addressed by the architect and is now in compliance. He also presented color pictures of the front (East, M-24 side) side of the building. Further questions were addressed regarding the site catch basin in regards to its depth.

Further discussion on the site's distance north of Newark road and limitations on the number of drives along M-24 along with compliance with MDOT standards.

Planner McLeod stated that the Church's drive will ultimately determine what happens with future driveways along M-24. If there were already a large number of driveways then it would be looked at closer. We can anticipate development on both sides of the church.

Commissioners discussed the 71 acres between the Church and the residence to the north. Discussion followed regarding MDOT, the Lapeer County Road Commission and access management standards for developing driveways in the area.

Pastor Schillack and parishioner Patti Kooy stated that the Church wants to be visible in the community. Before the M-24 expansion there were 25,000 cars per day going past. They are working with the national church to acquire financing. They have also been doing a stewardship campaign to raise funds. The church already owns the property and will ultimately own the building also.

Commissioners noted that the site plan must be renewed yearly if the project doesn't start within one year to remain an approved project.

Commissioner Lendt asked about the sign review for the project. Planner McLeod stated that the review was completed previously and there were no objections to the sign.

Commissioner Lendt asked for the commission to look at the eight standards for a special land use as stated in the zoning ordinance as this is the first site plan on M-24 since its expansion. Commissioners reviewed the standards for a special land use as stated in Article 6.02, Review Standards noting that all eight standards may not apply. Further discussion regarding the fit of a church located in a residential neighborhood.

Commissioners voiced concerns regarding an ambulance or fire truck having access under the canopy of the church in an emergency. The canopy height is 10' 6".

Commissioners noted that approval of the Special Land Use will include sign approval. Parishioner Patti Kooy noted that the building will be completed in earth tone colors. The architect has supplied a drawing. The church is still looking at specifics. We want a very tasteful look to the building.

MOVED by Green support by Ewing to approve Christ the King Lutheran Church special land use and sign request as it meets all of the criteria for a special land use. In addition the Church will submit the final building colors to the Township when a final decision is made. A roll call vote was taken: Ayes: (6) Green, Ewing, Roodvoets, Lendt, Thick and Cady. Nays: None. Absent: (1) Rutzen. **MOTION CARRIED.**

Chairman Roodvoets commended the church on a job well done. Representatives from Christ the King Church departed.

FENCE ORDINANCE:

Fence Ordinance, Article 1, Section 1.11 Fences, Walls and Other Protective Barriers, subsection (b):

The Planning Commission reviewed and discussed the following amendment:

Amend Article 1 General Provisions, by amending Section 1.11 Fences, Walls, and Other Protective Barriers, by amending subsection (b) as follows:

b. Fences in the Front Yard. Decorative fences (i.e. picket, split rail, wrought iron, etc.) shall be permitted within the front yard (that area between the residence and the front property line). Such fences shall not exceed a total height of four (4) feet (as measured from the established grade). Wire and chain link fencing, privacy, and any view obscuring type fencing shall not be permitted within the front yard regardless of height. Finally, such fence shall not extend into the existing right of way or easement of any adjacent roadway. No fence or wall shall interfere with the visibility from a driveway.

MOVED by Thick support by Lendt to approve the amended fence ordinance as submitted and forward to the Lapeer Township Board. A roll call vote was taken, Ayes: (6) Thick, Lendt, Cady, Ewing, Green and Roodvoets. Nays: None. Absent: (1) Rutzen. **MOTION CARRIED.**

TEMPORARY HOUSING:

Proposed Amendments to Article 1 General Provisions, Section 1.39 Temporary Housing:

Draft #3, February 16, 2009

Amend Article 1 General Provisions, by adding a new section, being Section 1.39 Temporary Housing, to read as follows:

Section 1.39 Temporary Housing

The Township Supervisor may grant approval for a single temporary dwelling on a site in the instance that new construction or reconstruction is necessary as a result of fire or other force of nature. The issuing of approval of a temporary dwelling shall only be permitted if a building permit has been issued for the construction of the principal residence, adequate assurance has been obtained that the temporary dwelling will be removed upon the completion of the main residence, the method of servicing the temporary dwelling with water and sanitary services has

been secured and all other necessary permits have also been obtained. The length of occupancy shall be valid up to one (1) year and may be extended by the Township Board for periods up to six months upon written request by the homeowner.

Discussion amongst the Planning Commissioners regarding the above proposed ordinance amendment. Should a bond be set within the ordinance to insure removal of any temporary structure or should the ordinance not stipulate any bond and let the Township Board set a policy to insure removal of a temporary structure.

Planning Commissioners would like the board to decide before they move any further on the Ordinance amendment for Temporary Housing .

VISIONING SESSION:

Focus Group Questions for Community Involvement:

The Planning Commission reviewed M-24 Focus Group Questions prepared by Planner Chris McLeod as follows:

The Township has long planned the M-24 Corridor for primarily residential purposes. Do you believe that with the current and future improvements on M-24 that this is still realistic or desirable.

If offices and retail stores were to be built along M-24 where would they be best located? Along the entire stretch, at all major intersections along entire corridor, at certain major intersections (name the intersections).

If office and retail stores were to be developed along M-24, what types of development would you desire? Would smaller, more local size developments or larger shopping centers which provide a more abundant number of choices be preferable?

Would you be willing to live in a house along M-24? Would you be willing to live in a subdivision that backed onto M-24? If so, what types of amenities or separation would you want between your house/subdivision and M-24. If you would not be willing to live along M-24, why not?

If office and retail stores were to develop along M-24, are there specific developments along the M-24 corridor (in other communities i.e. Oxford, Orion, Metamora, Lapeer) that you feel would be beneficial or appropriate for Lapeer Township?

What aspects of an office or retail development are most important to you as a resident; landscaping, building appearance/materials, traffic flow in and around the site, signage, lighting, etc.

If the Township needed to provide additional property for office and retail purposes where do you believe that that property should be located? M-24, Imlay City Road (M-21), Wilder Road and I-69 interchange, other?

Clerk Walker asked if it is feasible to hold a focus group in April?

Chairman Roodvoets stated that in the past residents wanted to maintain a rural flavor in the Township. Lengthly discussion followed.

Other questions that Commissioners favored are as follows:

- If you had a friend coming from out of town where would you take them? Where wouldn't you take them?
- Would you like to see the encouragement of more agri-business?
- Would you favor smaller or larger lot size for residential development?
- Would you like to encourage more home based business, based upon expanded technology (internet)?
- Are there any issues important to you that aren't being addressed?
- Are you taking advantage of the recycling program available? What do you like/not like about it?
- Any comments or suggestions regarding the Township Park & Recreation plan.

Further discussion followed regarding people working out of their homes, promoting technology and traffic safety and transportation.

PAVILION:

Commissioners Thick and Green took pictures throughout the surrounding communities of pavilions and presented them to the remaining commissioners. Discussion followed regarding the development of the pavilion. Will it be rented? Commissioner looked at restroom facilities. Should portable toilets be used or have permanent facilities? Income from rentals could be used for maintenance to the facility.

Commissioners also discussed designs of pavilions. Truss systems, steel roofs versus shingles, height of a pavilion, electrical power. They agreed that the Imlay City pavilion was the nicest. A enclosed storage area is a necessity as there is no storage at the Township hall. Is the current septic field large enough to accommodate permanent restroom facilities? The commission would like to get prices on a 30x72 pavilion with 12 feet of storage on the end. Also would like quotes on permanent restrooms.

CORRESPONDENCE::

Introduction to Planning & Zoning.

REPORTS:

Board report given by Clerk Walker.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business before the Commission,

MOTION by Ewing support by Thick to adjourn meeting at 10:30 p.m. By unanimous consent the meeting was adjourned.

Ruth Lendt
Secretary

Dawn M. Walker
Recording Secretary