

Vergennes Township

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

January 9, 2006

A meeting of the Vergennes Township Planning Commission was held on January 9, 2006 at the Township Offices. At 7:02 PM Chairman Jernberg called the meeting to order. Also present were Commissioners Kropf, Mastrovito, Medendorp, and Makuski (welcome to Bill!). Tardy was Gillett (7:05). Absent was Nauta. Assisting the commissioners was Jeanne Vandersloot, Township Zoning Administrator.

APPROVAL OF DECEMBER 5, 2005 MINUTES: Motion to approve by Mastrovito, seconded by Kropf. All approved.

APPROVAL OF/CHANGES TO AGENDA: Motion to approve by Medendorp, seconded by Kropf. All approved.

1. PUBLIC HEARING: ORDINANCE AMENDMENT - RENTAL STORAGE - SPECIAL EXCEPTION USE PERMIT.

Explanation by Vandersloot: Similar to current ordinance for rental storage which is an in-house approval/permitted use. 3.04.C adds the use to the RA district (as special exception use in RA). 4.31B, is the actual standards/general info for rental storage (e.g., no minimum acreage, no need for dwelling on the property). #7 in this section changes ZA approval to approval by Twp Board.

Public Hearing Opened 7:08 PM: Hearing none, the public hearing was closed at 7:08 PM.

Commissioner Discussion/Motion: Memo from Jay suggested a few things. Permitted use opportunity rental storage ordinance as a base for the new amendment is changing to add the new language with a review process. Should not be too many of these in the township. Some of his suggestions would require a new public hearing. This is for existing buildings, not new ones. Medendorp: Re: Jay's comment #6 it's a word change for clarification only, could be added without another public hearing.

Motion by Medendorp to recommend to the Township Board for approval, with the change of wording as specified in item #6 of Jay Kilpatrick's memo (replace "on the earlier date of" to "on or before"). Seconded by Gillett. All approved.

2. PRIVATE ROAD APPLICATION - LANGLOIS. Re: Triple Oak Drive. Since the last meeting with the Commission, application has provided the final draft of the maintenance agreement, a map showing the east parcels and also the permit from KC Road Commission. Latest maintenance agreement version delivered.

Jernberg: question about easement adjacent to the proposal from Kent County

Road Commission (KCRC). KCRC has a new blanket requirement to ask all developments where there is road frontage to grant additional 10-foot easement. Is it 10 feet total or ten on each side? Discussion. Langlois had to re-engineer after discussion with KCRC resulting in a slight dip by the road to prevent flooding if catch basins were full.

Per Vandersloot, on the Maintenance Agreement, the last two pages show the final adjustments wanted by the Attorney (letter dated 1-9-06).

Medendorp still a little concerned about the grade. Water's better handled this way. Township Engineer has approved the design.

Motion by Gillette to recommend to the Township Board to approve based on the drawing presented tonight, contingent on the changes to the Maintenance Agreement suggested by the Twp Attorney, and also with the addition of the map showing the interconnections of Langlois' other adjacent properties as part of the formal documentation for this project. Seconded by Kropf. All approved.

3. KENT COUNTY ROAD COMMISSION RIGHT OF WAY REQUEST - DISCUSSION. They want us to go from 66-foot to 86-foot right of ways. Per Tim Wittenbach: this is in case they need to widen the road as traffic grows. Jernberg: this gives them a blanket permission not specific to a particular right of way. Says "for future right-of-way." Purposes are understandable (e.g., sight lines, deceleration lanes). Wittenbach: They're asking us to impose that on new developments or new private road entrances if we think it's necessary. Jernberg: do we need to implement this into the ordinance? Jeanne can investigate. KCRC could come and present but had other obligations this evening. If this goes into our documents, the rules will be clear if this is in the ordinance. Should be clear that it's not required, but MAY be required. Some roads may not need it. Gillett: we should listen to the people from the county, and hear where they're coming from. Vandersloot will see if they can come to a future meeting with the members.

General Public Comment Time: Langlois: suggests the commission not blanketly apply the KCRC idea to all roads, there will be cases it's not necessary. Should be a case-by-case application. Jernberg: let's define it correctly upfront.

Motion to adjourn by Medendorp. Seconded by Gillett.
The next meeting is February 6, 2006
The meeting was adjourned at 7:37 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Kate Dernocoeur, Recorder