

WHITEWATER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING, September 4, 2013

Call to Order by Chairman Mangus: 7:02 pm

Roll Call: Bowerman, Lawson, Link, Lyons, Mangus, Miller

Absent: Dean

Set/Adjust Agenda: Set

Approval of Minutes: Approval of August 7, Regular Meeting Minutes: Motion to approve by Lawson seconded by Lyons. All in favor. Motion carries.

Declaration of Conflict of Interest None

Public Comment: Kim Halstead, 7923 Cook Rd., ZBA had another accessory building on the agenda, this needs to be addressed by the PC as soon as possible.

Public Hearing: None

Reports:

Correspondence: 1.) Disaster Recovery Planning 2.) Vaughn Harshfield letter.

Zoning Administrator, Popp: August 2013 Report. Very busy month. Vacation Rental Homes causing the most grief. This may have to be addressed further. It is a specific company and they are not returning calls. Ski slalom issue seems to be being handled through common courtesy. Skegemog Pt. Rd., private property at the road end. Plan reviews of more than one page should have an additional fee. Site Plan Reviews can take a lot of time and work. County does not necessarily have the information. PC could make a request to set up a fee structure with the help of the new, incoming zoning administrator. Costs are higher than the fees being charged. Put this issue on a future agenda for the PC. The new ZA should be able to start September 13. Will need to recreate the maps and charts.

Township Board Representative, Lawson: Approval process for Township Master Plan as outlined.

Chair, Dean: N/A

Old Business:

1. Re-read Part 2 as amended: Master Plan Goals. Use the word "guaranteed" in reference to the State of Michigan and U.S. Constitutions. Private property rights are not mentioned specifically in either Constitution. **Consensus with changes.**
2. Comments only on Parts 3, 4, 6 & 7: **Part 3**, page 8: Bibliography of the back ground studies in the appendix. Current appendix is only the company survey results. Remove bibliography reference since each chart and map will have the site source attached. 4th paragraph, use the actual state statute PA.33 of 2008. **Consensus with change.**
Page 10, demographics, sentence structure. **Consensus with change.**
Page 11, increase the size of the chart(s) where possible. **Consensus.**
Page 12, no graph needed. **Consensus with change.**
Page 13, Discussion regarding Chart 4 (needs to be created). Chart 5 referencing general expenditures of the township. **Consensus as discussed.**
Page 14, discussion. **Consensus as discussed.**
Page 15, 16 and 17 Add Watershed map if available? **Consensus.**
Part 4, all okay. **Consensus.**
Part 6, pages 22 and 23. Road maps need improvement, currently have the County road map.
Page 24, Discussion. Tart Trails map needs adjustment if possible. **Consensus.**
Part 7, all okay. **Consensus.**

New Business:

1. Review Master Plan Part 5 Discussion: Link: Use the current land use map and the current land use definitions. It presents a plan and we get to move on. Definitions do not match the map.

Mangus: Additional text explaining the definitions.

Link: Definitions are for future ideas. The Legend does not match the definitions.

Popp: Will start over with a new map.

Mangus: Use current map, change the legend to match the new definitions. Not altering anything just changing the titles of the zones/areas. New labels on existing locations. Remove P.U.D.

Popp: A P.U.D. is allowed pretty much anywhere. It transcends zoning. Define CoPud. Issue with taking high density to assume it is R3, medium density and R2 also. Do not see the direct correlation. Lots sizes / qualifiers have been removed.

Bowerman: Definitely raises questions.

Mangus: Master Plan information vs. Zoning.

Bowerman: That's why we wanted to use the Current Map.

Mangus: Scrap new definitions and use current with the current map.

Lawson: Definitions of current zones.

Popp: Available on the website.

2. Next Meeting: October 2, 2013

Appendix (new business)

Comments on Page 4 (old business)

Part 5 (old business)

Popp to provide comparison current land use definitions and new proposed definitions.

Public Comment:

John Mater: 302 Island View Dr., TC, 1st couple of sentences in the goals. I represent 100 residents in the Island Lake area. We have sent numerous messages regarding keeping RC1 rural. Packet had the summary of the survey. The survey supports the 5 acre requirement, not just in the state land. If we have to have all the Island Lake area people here or send in messages we can do that. Took an oath to uphold what the people want. Don't open it up to developers. Majority rules, 60% of the people want to keep our township rural so 5 acres in a significant portion of the township is appropriate. Too bad the 30% don't come in and let us know why they stand where they stand. We just would like to keep it rural. Acme development will have an impact on us. Do everything we can to keep it rural.

Mangus: Do you see anything in this document that would necessitate making an adjustment?

Mater: The 133 acres behind Island Lake is an example. The definition for low density and medium density are very much different. Would we need to create an RC4 or and RC0? As soon as you are finished with this you are going to be working on the zoning ordinance? It could be stopped right here.

Popp 6237 Elk View Dr.: A part of the planning commission, I hear many times, many people on this PC and this Board want lower acreage. Who amongst these groups has a gain here? I have not seen anything that indicates we want to develop. I have development aspirations but not in RC1.

Ask that these people, let's be specific, work on the divide that separates us.

Continuing Education: None

Adjournment: 9:10p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Lois MacLean, Recording Secretary

TABLED ITEMS / FUTURE TOPICS LIST:

Non-conformities; Permitted and Special Uses; Essential Services; Fences, Village District;

TC-TALUS; Road Map with setbacks and boundaries; Short Term Rentals; Signs; Zoning fee structure