

# Vergennes Township

## PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

September 5, 2000

A meeting of the Vergennes Township Planning Commission was held on September 5, 2000 at the Township Offices. At 7:00 PM the meeting was called to order by Chairman Nauta. Also present were Commissioners Alger, Baird, Culross, Gillett, Jernberg, Lenihan, Weber and Warning.

**APPROVAL OF AUGUST MINUTES:** Motion to approve by Baird, seconded by Lenihan. All approved.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA:** Motion to approve by Gillett, seconded by Alger. All approved.

### OLD BUSINESS

**1. INFORMATIONAL REVIEW OF PUD DEVELOPMENT FOR JOE HOST.** Ron Van Singel from Nederveld Associates (engineering/surveying) spoke on behalf of JPH Development Co. to describe the proposed PUD of 54.6 acres at 11311 Bailey Drive. Trying to make creative lots on the parcel. Test plan has been handed out, showing 15 lots that meet specs (3 acres, 300 ft. frontage). PUD arrives at 18 lots, with screening process to shield adjacent property via a conservation easement. Part of site is in “common area” available to use of residents via Master Deed & restrictive covenants, with walking trail surrounding parcel. Pond. Private Drive. Host home on one lot. Lots in different clusters. Left vegetation on Bailey Drive. 175 feet in from Bailey before reaching any building site. Center pod has an existing reconditioned barn on it. Most lots clustered in rear of lot. Variety of lot sizes from 1.02 acres to 2+ acres. A currently-shared drive will be changed to preserve one curb cut. Sight distance is 500 feet. 30.08 acres of green space. New driveway configuration from original plan is smoother flow overall, and added to size of proposed Lot #4.

Mike Willard in the audience asked about where the water would come from. Preliminary plan shows individual septic/private wells on each lot for 18 proposed homes. Traffic?/onto Bailey via one curb cut.

Baird: ponds considered common space?/yes.

Jernberg: conservation easement says there would be no alteration, what’s to stop building later?/answer: building envelopes are depicted in the proposal. Jernberg further inquired how conservation easement comes into common area calculation?/ 2 methods of calculating were explained.

Gillett: why doesn’t Lot 3 join Lot 2?/to provide isolation for the individual who is developing the acreage.

Questions about vegetation and forest buffer. Reforested hardwood. Reforested

pine (early 50s). Tall trees.

Nauta: conservation easements written into Master Deed not to be touched?/yes, those areas are non-buildable, unalterable.

Jay Kilpatrick: explained how some real estate is being counted as both common area and conservation easement in order to meet the PUD - they've found a creative way to meet the needs of the ordinance. Weber: pitfalls of double-counting. General agreement that we might want to make the ordinance more clear.

Private road length qualifies re: length

Other discussion: using pond for common space calculation; common space used by other driveway coming into the private drive to avoid a second curb cut (put the road onto the plan in final plan); soil borings look ok; show on drawings width of conservation easements; path = cleared area, up to association. Pond is about 10 feet at deepest, 3-1/2 feet at shallow end. Concerns about drowning. Association to handle via Master Deed. Private road is designed according to the standards, will be paved. Joe will show the parcel if interested. Night sky protection - no need for road lights. Utilities will be buried.

Compliments about the plan include: keeping Bailey looking the same, not chewing up farmland, keeping green space, that it's a nice-looking plan.

**2. ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS FOR MANUFACTURED HOME DEVELOPMENTS.** Purpose of reviewing is due to lawsuits in surrounding communities. Cannot list a manufactured home development as a special use in your ordinance (which is how it is here). Our ordinance is therefore essentially invalid, or subject to litigation. There are interested developers, but no applications yet.

Could we put a moratorium on this sort of development until we study this more? This is tying our ordinance to the state standards, so this should be a relatively quick process. This change focuses on R-3 and tying to the state which gives regulatory strength. Public hearing needs to happen.

Normal site plan standards are considered construction standards. State standards regulate via their standards, taking it out of the local jurisdictional control. This change is a permitted use in R3 if we adopt this, rather than treating it as a Special Exception Use.

**Motion** by Gillett: have a public hearing on the changes as they are written at October 2 meeting. Seconded by Weber. All approved.

Culross suggested a subcommittee to examine this issue on a deeper level. Get with Jeanne and Jay.

Motion to adjourn by Culross Seconded by Jernberg.

The next meeting is a special meeting of the commission, to be held September 25, 2000. The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Kate Dernocoeur, Recorder