

**Charter Township Of Lyon
Planning Commission Special Meeting
Meeting Minutes
March 27, 2006**

Approved as corrected on April 24, 2006

Date: March 27, 2006
Time: 7:00 PM
Place: 58000 Grand River

Mr. Barber called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

Roll Call

Present: Barber, Mike (Chair)
Dome, Jim
Hamilton, Jim
Hicks, John (Board Liaison)
James, Laura (Secretary)
Williams, Laura

Absent: Soper, Ted

Also present: Philip Seymour, Township Attorney
Chris Doozan, Township Planner
Alexis Marcarello, Township Planner
Michelle Aniol, Township Planner
Al Hogan, Township Building Official
Chris Olson, Twp. Superintendent

Guests: 20

Approval of Agenda:

Mr. Doozan added Miles Christi to the agenda to schedule a public hearing.

Mr. Hamilton moved "to approve the agenda for March 27, 2006 as changed." Ms. Williams supported the motion.

Voice vote:

Ayes: all

Nays: none

Absent: Ted Soper

Motion approved unanimously.

Approval of Consent Agenda: February 27, 2006

Ms. James made a motion "that we approve the February 27th meeting minutes." Mr. Hamilton supported the motion.

Voice vote:

Ayes: all

Nays: none

Absent: Ted Soper

Motion approved unanimously

Ms. Williams made the motion "that we add a third public hearing scheduling under new business for discussion and possible scheduling of public hearing to consider a Township initiated rezoning from RM-1, suburban Townhouse

district to R-0.3, single family residential district of parcels 21-15-101-039, 21-15-101-040, and 21-15-101-041, located on the south side of Twelve Mile Road and east side of Milford Road.” Ms. James supported the motion.

Voice vote:

Ayes: all

Nays: none

Absent: Ted Soper

Motion approved unanimously.

Comments from public on Non-Agenda Items: None

Public Hearings:

1. AP-06-02.a, Thompson Hauling, Nine Mile and Griswold Road, Public hearing to consider special use request for construction clean-up operation; Recommend table action on the site plan up to 60 days following the public hearing.

Mrs. Aniol reviewed the comments in the McKenna Associates letter dated January 23, 2006.

Mr. Barber asked if anyone had an objection to tabling this item. The Planning Commission Board did not get an opportunity to look at the blue prints that were dropped off today.

Mr. Seymour commented that if you table it and give a date then you do not have to republish.

Ms. James made the motion “to continue this until the April 10th meeting.” Mr. Dome supported the motion.

Voice vote:

Ayes: all

Nays: none

Absent: Ted Soper

Motion approved unanimously.

2. Public hearing to consider the updated Master Plan.

Ms. Marcarello presented a power point presentation on the proposed Lyon Township Master Plan. She explained that the plan would replace the current plan, which was adopted in 1999 and amended in 2001. Ms. Marcarello also explained that the Municipal Planning Act requires communities periodically prepare and adopt general or master plans. The act was amended so that plans are required to be reviewed and updated every 5 years. Ms. Marcarello described the function of a master plan.

1. The plan has a detailed description of the community.
2. It projects the future needs of the community.
3. It has future land use recommendations, usually presented on a map and language that explains the intent of each future land use.

Ms. Marcarello then discussed and shared the data that McKenna had discovered. The population of Lyon Township is 12,408. In 2010, the population is suggested to be about 26,000. In 2020, the population will be 37,000 and in 2030 the population will be about 49,000. Data was also taken on the build-out analysis. “Based on the current zoning districts, at build-out, the population could be 45,360 residents and 16,028 dwelling units.” Ms. Marcarello also explained that a priority was updating the existing land use inventory. Almost half of the land in the Township is still vacant, used for agriculture, or golf courses. Therefore, the Township still has a chance to shape the Township into the form we want. Ms. Marcarello said that the Planning Commission has found that the goals and policies in the “old” plan have not change. The plan had eight planning and development goals. These goals are residential and agricultural development, commercial development, research and industrial development, environmental policies, transportation policies, recreation facilities and policies on community facilities. These goals and policies form the backbone of the future land use map. Ms. Marcarello continued to explain that the future land use plan calls for continuing the established development patterns found in the Township today. Most of the development should be between Grand River and I-96 in the north and around the City of South Lyon in the southwest. There are two commercial development districts and low-density single family residential being planned for the remainder of the Township. The future land use plan calls for transitional land use planning. This is where the Township will organize uses based on a smooth transition by arranging them in a series of lower intensity uses. Industrial uses are at the high end and single family residential is at the low end. Ms. Marcarello also went into detail about the two

areas that will receive special treatment. One area is Ten Mile. It is anticipated that the Ten Mile Road Corridor will fully develop within the next decade. A plan has been developed to keep Ten Mile rural looking. The second area of special treatment is the New Hudson area. This is where the “new” future land use map is much different than the “old.” There are five goals for New Hudson:

1. Promote a pedestrian-friendly downtown.
2. Reorganize the traffic.
3. Enrich neighborhood commercial and office uses.
4. Incorporate the history of New Hudson into the design.
5. Incorporate natural resources to support the uses and character of the village.

Ms. Marcarello ended by stating, “It is our recommendation that the Planning Commission adopt the plan.”

Public Hearing opened at 7:36 p.m.

Ruby Graham 56350 Ten Mile Road, South Lyon – The new chapter in regards to Ten Mile Road greatly interests her. She relocated to Lyon Township from Georgia and likes the rural atmosphere. She said that she was not aware of the new master plan meeting until she read the South Lyon Herald. This is new information to her. Her concern was that she would have a shopping center in her backyard. One of her questions was she wanted to know what the 14 percent “other uses of the land” was in the pie chart. What is the “other”? Ms. Marcarello answered that the piece on the pie chart that was marked “other” represented landfills, communications, rights-of-way, and open water. It’s a simplified version so that the pie chart did not get too small. Ms. Graham commented that she would appreciate it if the Township kept her better informed on issues regarding her property and the areas near her property. She asked how she could get a copy of the Master Plan. Ms. Marcarello answered that the master plan is still in draft form. If it is adopted, it will be available for view or purchase at the Township Hall and on display at the Township Library. Ms. Marcarello also commented that the Ten Mile Corridor mostly focused on how to treat the edge facing Ten Mile when new subdivisions come in. We do not want to see homes on top of the road. Ms. Graham is also concerned as to when the Township is going to tell her that Ten Mile needs to be widened.

Jeff Appel 20876 Oak Tree Drive, South Lyon - Mr. Appel commented that he just found out that a portion of his property was being rezoned. His property is currently 28 acres and zoned B-2. The Township is looking to change it to approximately 10 acres B-2 and 14 acres as Multiple. Mr. Appel asked why he never received a letter regarding this issue. Mr. Appel also commented that he felt the new zoning was a downgrade and a devaluation of his property. Mr. Appel also gave the Planning Commission a letter stating his concerns. Mr. Doozan explained that this is not a rezoning; this is a master plan change. Mr. Appel commented that he thinks the Township should have to notify the property owners. He also said that he thought this is something that the property owner should ask for. Mr. Doozan clarified that this is not a rezoning change. There is nothing being changed to the zoning. What is currently being discussed is the change to the master plan and the future land use map. In regards to the notification requirements, they are different for master plan changes than zoning changes. With a master plan change, the law requires that there be a notification placed in the newspaper. Mr. Olson commented that the current master plan has Mr. Appel’s property under moderate density single family equivalent to R-0.5. The proposed master plan has it under low density, multiple family. In terms of density it is an upgrade and there is no change in zoning. It is still B-2.

Ms. James objected that the Planning Commission and the Township have been going through this for three years and Ms. James suggested to the planners that they notify people who live close to areas being affected. Ms. James commented that the planners said there were no significant changes to the future land use map; therefore, it was not necessary to notify anyone. Ms. James suggested that a density change next to a single-family residential subdivision is significant. It was not brought up in past meetings and if it was brought up, Ms. James would have asked that surrounding neighbors be notified. Ms. James said that she does not feel comfortable with the change.

Mr. Appel asked if his property was going to stay zoned B-2, and if he wants to rezone the property to what is in the master plan, then the Township would not give him a hard time. Ms. Marcarello answered that he can do all uses permitted within the B-2 district. If Mr. Appel wanted to do something else, then the Township looks to the master plan as the guide. Mr. Appel said that now he understands what is going on and he does not object to it. However, he does object to the way people were notified.

Ms. James asked if the Township would be changing the Appel property from half-acre lots to 4 houses per acre. Mr. Olson asked Mr. Doozan if he viewed that as a good transition. Mr. Doozan said that it was changed to create a good transition. There is a buffer between the subdivision and the property; there are wetlands there. Ms. James commented that her concern was with the County Drain that is there. The drain also serves as a wild life corridor. There are dead animals on the road everyday there. There is a lot of wildlife there and that is going to affect the development potential.

Allan Radium 56414 Nine Mile Road, South Lyon – Mr. Radium is a strong supporter of the master plan. He liked how he heard that there was no significant change to the master plan. His hope is that there is nothing in the master plan that will in the future hurt the Township.

Bob Seccombe, 56888 Nine Mile, South Lyon – Mr. Seccombe suggested that the new master plan get a legal review. Mr. Seymour commented that he and Mr. Quinn have been active in the process.

Kevin Waylene, 59300 Ten Mile, South Lyon – He commented that the master plan does sound nice. He thinks that the Ten Mile rural area is a little off base. If you drive down Ten Mile Road the only spot that is open is at Ten Mile and Napier Road. He does want his property to be considered zoned commercial. The reason he says that is because there are three commercial lots near him. He had a neighbor that could not sell his house. If it is not zoned commercial the property owners may lose a lot. Mr. Waylene also commented that the traffic is very heavy. Ms. James commented that Mr. Waylene may wish to renew his request in about 10 years.

John Bell, 23113 Currie Road – Mr. Bell said that he would be willing to put the master plan in the Library. He also stated for the record that he noticed that in the plan it talked about the Lyon Township Library and Senior Center. He thought it would be better to call it a Community Center. This way it is consistent with what has been done in the past.

Public hearing closed at 8:15.

Mr. Barber commented that the master plan has not changed a lot. There might be a few changes in the future. It makes the master plan stronger when we review everything.

Mr. Hicks commented that it sounded like Mr. Appel was not aware of the previous master plan.

Mr. Dome asked if it would be possible to take the existing plan and make an overlay of the new and existing plan so people can come to the Township and review the plans. Ms. Aniol and Ms. Marcarello said that they could do that.

Ms. Williams asked how people were going to get their comments in after the public hearing. Ms. Marcarello said that if the Planning Commission adopts it tonight, it is adopted. If it is not adopted tonight the public could write comments or come to a meeting. Ms. Williams commented that she thought that it had to go to the Township Board first. Mr. Olson answered no.

Ms. Williams commented that she did not know how the others felt, but she was not comfortable with this because so many people did not get a chance to see the plan.

Mr. Barber commented that the second meeting of every month has been devoted to discussion to some area of this plan and it has been in the paper. There was a lot of talk, study, and thought that went into it.

Ms. James asked the Planning Commission their thoughts on the Appel property. She suggested that they take it out of the master plan so they can approve the master plan tonight. Ms. James gave three reasons as to why she opposed changing the future land use map on the Appel parcel.

1. It is an environmentally sensitive piece of property.
2. The neighbors did not get notice and that is not appropriate notice.
3. By changing the density on the parcel when the owner has not formally asked the Planning Commission to do so, the Planning Commission will not be able to exchange site improvements in exchange for density increase.

Mr. Dome commented that as a multiple zoning, that is standard zoning practice. Ms. James said that it is a change on a future land use map to go from two houses an acre to four houses. Mr. Hicks' biggest concern is a commercial use adjacent to a residential without any transition. Ms. James suggested that the Planning Commission see what the landowners in the area think about the property. They may have an opinion on whether the property should be commercial, multiple family, or two houses per acre.

Mr. Doozan commented that they had the option of postponing the public hearing for two weeks and in the mean time notifying the property owners. Ms. James commented that was an option. She also commented that another option is to wait and see what Mr. Appel has in mind and leave it alone.

Mr. Barber commented that the Planning Commission decided not to zone that R-1.0 because of all the traffic. Mr. Olson commented that on that property it is easy to see the backsides of stores and it is more of a transition to go with the multiple family in that commercial area. Mr. Olson also commented that he looked at this as an accommodation and Mr. Appel was discussing how he would like to have even more density. Ms. James asked why the Township owed him any accommodations at all.

Mr. Barber commented that future land use is a proposal. The zoning has not been changed. It is just a plan.

Ms. James commented that once a future land use map is changed and the density is bumped up, it is difficult to bump it down. Mr. Seymour said if someone comes in with a plan asking for it to be rezoned to that use, it is difficult to say no.

Mr. Hicks commented that this is not something that is put on a shelf and not looked at again for five year. If a problem is found, it can be addressed.

Ms. Williams asked if the Township has gotten any information from other agencies and organizations. Mr. Doozan commented that he did not get any feedback. Ms. Williams was wondering if we got any suggestions. Mr. Doozan said that he heard from Oakland County and it was very positive. Ms. Marcarello said that of the ten communities notified only two or three responded.

Ms. Williams asked if there was anything in the master plan that they missed. She would like to wait and see the overlay and get one last look before approving it.

Mr. Hamilton agreed with Ms. James that they should not change the Appel property.

Mr. Dome commented that he thought the Township needed areas for multiple housing. Mr. Hamilton commented that if it is left R-1.0, it is going to have a 15-foot set back and no bargaining power.

Ms. Williams commented that she hated to rush. She agreed with Ms. James that the master plans needs to be adopted, but did not want to rush.

Ms. James made a motion "that we request our planners amend the draft to the master plan dated March 27th, 2006 so that the future land use draft with respect to the Appel property on Eight Mile near Pontiac Trail be the same as the current future land use map." Mr. Hamilton supported the motion.

Voice vote:

Ayes: Mike Barber, Jim Hamilton, Laura James, and Laura Williams

Nays: Jim Dome, John Hicks

Absent Ted Soper

Motion approved.

Ms. James made a motion "that we revise the color coding for the future land use map to clarify the location of school properties, the well house, and the waste water treatment plant on the future land use map as requested by the Township superintendent." Mr. Dome supported the motion.

Voice vote:

Ayes: all

Nays: none

Absent: Ted Soper

Motion approved unanimously.

Ms. James made the motion “that this Planning Commission of Lyon Township hereby resolve to adopt the master plan as our guide to the over all development and growth of this Township for the next five years as amended.” Mr. Hamilton supported the motion.

Voice vote:

Ayes: Mike Barber, Jim Dome, Jim Hamilton, John Hicks, Laura James,

Nays: Laura Williams

Absent: Ted Soper

Motion approved.

Old Business:

3. AP-05-47, Pulte Land Development, Public hearing to consider an amendment to Pinehurst Planned Development plan to allow the relocation of lots #1 and #2 in order to construct a pool, clubhouse, tot lot, and parking area; discussion and action on the site plan following the public hearing (recommended additional tables up to 60 days.)

Ms. James moved “that we table this for up to 60 days.” Mr. Hamilton supported the motion.

Voice vote:

Ayes: all

Nays: none

Absent: Ted Soper

Motion approved unanimously.

New Business:

4. AP-06-11, Josh Haron Paintball Facility, north side of Pontiac Trail, east of Silver Lake Road schedule a public hearing to consider a special use request for a privately owned and operated outdoor recreation facility (paintball); discussion and action on the site plan would follow the public hearing.

Ms. James moved “that we schedule this hearing for the 24th of April.” Mr. Hamilton supported the motion.

Voice vote”

Ayes: all

Nays: none

Absent: Ted Soper

Motion approved unanimously.

5. Discussion and possible scheduling of public hearing to consider a Township initiated rezoning from RM-1, suburban Townhouse District to R-0.3, Single Family Residential District of parcels 21-15-101-039, 21-15-101-040, and 21-15-101-041, located on the south side of Twelve Mile Road and east of Milford Road.

Ms. James made a motion “that we schedule it for April 24th.” Ms. Williams supported the motion.

Voice vote:

Ayes: all

Nays: none

Absent: Ted Soper

Motion approved unanimously.

6. AP-06-12, Miles Christi Site Plan and Special Use Request for a religious facility, conference center, gym, and living quarters, located on the east side of Johns Road, north of Ten Mile Road.

Ms. James made a motion “to schedule it for April 24th.” Mr. Hamilton supported the motion.

Voice vote:

Ayes: all

Nays: none

Absent: Ted Soper

Motion approved unanimously.

Mr. Barber adjourned the meeting at 8:50 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Catherine Culver
Catherine Culver
Recording Secretary