

Planning Commission Minutes  
April 5, 1999

A meeting of the Vergennes Township Planning Commission was held on April 5, 1999 at the Township Offices. At 7:00 PM the meeting was called to order by Chairman Tim Howard. Also present were Commissioners Alger, Culross, Dalga, Jernberg, Nauta, and Pfaller. Absent were Commissioners Gillett and Weber.

Approval of March Minutes: Motion to approve minutes by Pfaller with the following changes:  
Record number of “yeas” and “nays” in Driveway Setback votes.

3 yeas and 4 nays to leave ordinance as is.

4 yeas and 3 nays in favor of scheduling a Public Hearing on removing the 15-foot driveway setback from the ordinance.

Pfaller also requested additional information be added to the Other Business section:  
A list of parcels near the State Game Area.

Seconded by Alger. All Approved.

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

### PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO RA DISTRICT REGARDING CHILD CARE FACILITES

Howard opened the Public Hearing at 7:15, and reminded all present that the Township was not approving anything specific at this time, such as the Lally Daycare request. They are only reviewing text language and general use and standards of licensed day care facilities.

Chairman Howard opened the floor for comments and questions:

Duncan – Normally daycare facilities are residential, so why is this now becoming an issue?

Mark Hagerman – What roads would be considered primary roads and how would you define these roads?

Jerry Hall – Should be defined as adequate sewer. Most townships are looking to preserve land, not give it up.

Jim Nickedemski – Are there other areas for RA to build child care facilities? Could we expect taxes to decrease on Lally? If they allow child care, why not laundry facilities.

Kay Wisner – Would like to applaud the Board in putting up this facility – it is greatly needed.

Cindy Koval – Moved into the area because it’s rural. Will greatly effect her life style as a runner.

Sheila McCarie – Will never take her children to a daycare facility with a hundred other children.

Cindy Sweetman – Where are these 100 families coming from? Lally is not a direct route. Is one of the commissioners related to the person requesting this daycare facility?

Jane Anible– How many are against RA uses?

John Ashenbermer – Knows of several daycare homes that are not currently full. Why do we need this facility?

Mike Stevens – In favor of facility. Thinks a quality daycare center is great.

Mary Meyer – Her biggest concern focused on the sewer systems. They were promised for Murray Lake residences only. Pumps back up from time to time.

Kathy Longhorn – 1st concern is that the daycare is so close to Orchard (pesticides). 2nd concern was car and boat access traffic.

Nate Brink – Feels there is a lot of misinformation passed around. Will there be more specific information further down the road?

Harold Simpson – Why was this piece of land chosen?

Brad Roomer – How would number of children allowed at daycare facility be adhered to? Text open ended to allow for “x” number.

Denise – Bought property for leisure, not to have a bunch of kids around.

Jim Ladd – Feels this property would be turned down due to sewer system.

Jean – Would other RA applications be allowed due to limited sewer?

Russ Graves – Keep traffic on main road, such as 5 mile.

L. Swedman – Has petitions against daycare facility. What steps still need to be made? Is there another piece of property that would be more suitable?

Other comments – Who would pay for sewer and yard repairs? What about road and weight restrictions (i.e. large trucks bringing in supplies, etc.)?

Would building be built to comply with other houses?

How about coming up with master plan instead of piece meal approach?

Alger thanked everyone for coming out and giving all their input. Asked for more specific information on how and why this daycare facility would effect their lives.

Howard proposed to board to table this proposed amendment until the May meeting when all commissioners would be present.

Motion by Alger to table. Seconded by Pfaller. All approved.

#### PROPOSED SIGN ORDINANCE AMENDMENT

Howard read Home Occupation section to group. Pfaller pointed out that everything would be changed to 4 square foot sign.

Motion by Alger to approve. Seconded by Culross. All approved.

#### PROPOSED ACCESSORY BUILDING SETBACK AMENDMENT

Question asked from Jean if there's anything on acreage? Mark responded that it goes back to what's currently on the books.

Greg Murray – In favor of setback.

Jeannie V. – If intent is furthest point, could this be a problem?

4A) Size/Location – Is this defined further?

Motion by Dalga to approve. Seconded by Jernberg. All approved

#### PROPOSED DRIVEWAY SETBACK AMENDMENT

One individual pointed out that it took one full year to have someone in his plat comply. Recommends we also do away with cul de sac. Nothing in our ordinance that addresses cul de sacs and should it be added?

Motion by Nauta to postpone to next month. Seconded by Dalga. All approved.

#### **PUBLIC HEARINGS CLOSED - 8:35 PM.**

#### INFORMAL SITE PLAN REVIEW – John DeVries, Alden Nash Ave.

John and Fran DeVries are proposing to divide their 9.09 acres of land, which is currently zoned R-A, into 4 parcels. DeVries would like to enter into an agreement with his neighbor to the South, David Thayler, who is also developing his acreage, but is zoned R-1. The shared project would be served with public sewer and water, and would require an extension and upgrade of the existing private road which serves the property. It is currently zoned RA and are requesting it be rezoned to R1.

Pfaller favorably agrees with the addition of water and sewer and was surprised they were not requesting an R2 rezoning. DeVries was asked how this request meets the objectives of the planning process. The Planning Commission also advised DeVries to pay application fees in order to meet formal request criteria. There was discussion concerning 21 days notice required for rezoning. DeVries was told that the approval process would require it to be put on the agenda for a formal review and then a public hearing. In an attempt to quickly expedite this request, Howard suggested they have their Public Hearing at 6:30 before the May Planning Commission meeting.

#### DISCUSSION CONCERNING LAND DIVISIONS

Daneman pointed out that there is no formal public hearing process for private roads. Section 202.006 would need to be amended. What should be the criteria for requiring a public hearing? Daneman suggested anything over 5 or more homes on a road. Also pointed out that the ordinance is written in such a manner that forces a delay in the process by requiring the “not less than 20 days”.

Other issues discussed were parallel roads, new land divisions on existing private roads, extensions of private roads, number of shared driveways currently in township and necessary requirements for paving a private road. Culross would like to look into further and see additional examples. Howard also suggested they wait for more information.

The next meeting is Monday, May 3rd at 6:30 PM.  
Meeting adjourned at 8:57 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheila Kyllonen, Substitute Recorder