

DRAFT
WHITEWATER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF JANUARY 4, 2012, REGULAR MEETING

Call to Order by Zakrajsek at 7:00 pm

Roll Call: Zakrajsek, Dean, Boyd, Link, Miller, Lyons, Mangus, Recording Secretary-MacLean, Zoning Administrator-Meyers + 2 audience and Ron Akers for presentation.

Absent: None

Set/Adjust Agenda: Change order of agenda Motion by Boyd, to make Fences first, then Election of Officers then the Questionnaire, table the camp/campgrounds and ADU's, seconded by Mangus, all in favor. Motion carried.

Approval of Minutes of 11/2/2011 meeting. Motion by Boyd to approve with added public comment information from Steve Mangus, seconded by Lyons; all in favor. Motion Carried.

Approval of Minutes of 12/7/2011 meeting. Motion by Boyd to approve, seconded by Miller; all in favor. Motion Carried.

Conflict of Interest: None declared

Public Comment: Steve Mangus: 1214 Cerro, TC, talking about the MP: when I became aware of what was going on at the twp. Analyzed from a personal perspective, I began educating myself, learning and understanding. Reference to Sustainable America book, from the President Clinton time. Expresses extreme viewpoints in some areas. Has a huge influence on the local governments. "Grand Visions" are all over this country, same thing, different places. This came out in February of 1996. The things I see as the "wow" items came out about that same time. Recommend reading. It is centralized control. Interesting how the information came to be.

Public Hearing: NONE

Reports:

Correspondence: Planning magazines.

ZA Report: December report. One permit in December, 5 new houses in the works. New president at Mill Brook, getting him up to speed. Applied for 2% grants, going for 2 Lucas Units for mechanical CPR. TCTALUS, board of directors voted for them to become a part of NWCOG for resource sharing and increase regional awareness. In order to get grants and help from them, agree or disagree, we have to work with them. Did not make the metropolitan numbers in the census, we have 56,000; need 100,000 to be considered metropolitan.

Township Board Rep: Boyd: The news listed MI as the 4th in losing population, a step down from 3rd. That is a national problem.

Chair: Nothing

Old & New Business:

1. FENCES Certain provisions that will apply to all, neat and safe. Must allow emergency access to the property. The finished appearance shall face exterior of the lot. Shall not be erected where it would prevent adjacent property access. Property line issues, permission of adjacent property owners, could eliminate the expense of a survey. Stake,

string prior to application for land use permit. Zakrajsek: what happens if the neighbors cannot agree on the property line and the snow bird comes back and there is a fence. Don't want to put the township in the middle. Mangus: don't permit it, don't condone it, let it be between the neighbors; state that it must be on their own property, that's it. Mangus: would like to strike after the first part of E, strike F. Boyd: Residential fences, questions Barbed wire, electric charges or fences with sharp materials on top are prohibited what about people who want to fence in a garden area. Meyers: so many feet from the property line, etc. Boyd: residential usage Meyers: secure the fence for crops / garden. Miller: how about the invisible fences for pets. Mangus: 50 ft from the water – for the safety of kids. Allow a shorter see through fence. Link: 50 feet from the water is good. Mangus: balance safety and scenic. Meyers: Unique to circumstance, not unique to property. Zakrajsek: cannot cut trees, etc., on the water. Link: height restrictions for agricultural. Meyers: height restriction was the issue the last time this came up. There will be an uproar if we allow fences right down to the water. Mangus: concerned about kids and dogs. Boyd: keep it general instead of specific. Meyers to make some changes and bring it back next month.

2. Election of Officers: Motion by Boyd to leave the three existing officers in place the way they are: Zakrajsek as Chair, Miller as Vice Chair, and Lyons as Secretary, seconded by Miller. Mangus offered to be Chair, must change or vote on the motion the way it stands, chose to vote on it as presented. Roll Call vote: Zakrajsek-yes; Dean-yes; Boyd-yes; Link-yes; Miller-yes; Lyons-yes; Mangus-no. **Motion carried 6-1.**
3. Simple Questionnaire: Base starting point for a questionnaire, pertaining to zoning and lot size in the state forest area. Idea is that this will go specifically to that area. The history of zoning in that area could be under question. Rough, first draft. Under 400 property owners, Meyers guesses it is about 150 (RC1). Island Lake is in the R1 district. Link: what is the value of knowing that they do not know this? Mangus: because there have been zoning changes and they think their property is zoned a certain way and find out it is not. Is it still an issue about lot size in the southern end of the twp? Lyons: Question 5: is the 5 acre minimum a concern? Twp wide survey only asked one question and we knew at that time we were going to have to get more information together for this. Boyd: State of Michigan is putting a moratorium on how many acres they can have. Meyers: we have a lot of people who bought in RC1; we should know when the people bought into the area. Mangus: question 1, when did you or your family acquire property? We are trying to educate the people. Link: people need to come and read the zoning if they are going to do anything. Mangus: Cannot find documentation to show that the 5 acre minimum ruling was or was not handled properly. Back track, see if it is a problem. Zakrajsek: trying to gather information. Harshfield (from the audience): Are we ignoring the survey? We don't like the results of the survey so we are trying to work around that. You are ignoring the survey. Sending a special flyer for special interest people. You will keep going at this until you get ½ acre minimums. Zakrajsek: as a commission we did agree to this. Meyers: will put this together for next time. Zakrajsek: this has been a hot topic for a long time. Originally it was stated that we would need to do more questions on this.
4. Master Plan Goals: Future land use map is based on goals. Read through the goals at this time. Low Density, Single Family residential (LDSF). Most of the RC1 is state land. Created a map that took all the privately owned property and make them low density. There are not very many areas of development in the area. Prior to the change it was 40,000 sq ft (roughly an acre). Creating the new district would allow us to respect the

property of those owners down there but it would not take away the rural character. People would have the ability to split a few times but not a very dense development. An LDSF residential district could meet the goal. It does not give a minimum lot width (currently at 300 ft frontage). New rules can be created for that. It maintains all the RC1 in state ownership; it would keep that at RC1, keep it at 5 acre and 300 ft. Preserves the rural character, builds a sense of community, open space. If the state decided they wanted to sell or trade land it would maintain the current 5 acre. Mangus: is this spot zoning? Meyers: the state does regularly trade land. We can go by the Master Plan goals to support the zoning. Mangus: with RC1 is there any issue with the current work on the conjoined homes / mother-in-law home. Medium Density Single Family residential (MDSF) where we have a lot of land that is zoned ag and it is not ag. Perhaps that could take on a designation as low density, single family residential. How did waterfront residential end up as R1? Make a Waterfront Residential (WF) area. Wintergreen Heights, medium density. Legally non conforming, 20,000 sq ft lot size – it would be difficult to create today. Big difference between legal non-conforming and non-conforming. Steve Mangus (from audience): get another outside opinion. Meyers: We need to pick areas that the soils are suitable. Discussion on lot size and septic systems. R2 means more density, why would we want to put our more dense residential near the industrial area? Close to a lot of interesting soil types. Maybe the MP needs to reflect that sewers should go there in the future. The survey has told us that they want to restrict commercial to where it is now. Would like everyone to take their map and think about this. Think of the areas south of M72 that are not ag. Just identifying who and what they are. Read through the goals again. Mangus: R2 = medium density? Encourage – sewer and water. The old village and the new village, right some of the wrongs and be practical. Mobile home park area is on Bunkerhill. Flexible, commercial, residential and industrial in the village. Uses are permitted, form based coding. Mixed use in the village areas, old and new. Zakrajsek: you want to change the future land use map? Meyers: A Future Land Use map is just to show what we would like it to become. From current zoning to the future land use zoning. Boyd: Need to grasp these proposals. Revisit with more time to investigate. Explanation of what and why it is very good. Start with Meyers' explanation and what and how this will be used. "Ground Rules" on rezoning. Future Land Use map will be in the Master Plan to show where it fits the goals.

Zakrajsek: summarize, working on introduction, section two will become section 4. Will need to go through everything. Next meeting, Wednesday, January 11, 2012, to complete Intro and section 2 (the new 4). Mangus: revision for the intro. Then we can go on to the next section.

Continuing Education:

Public Comment: Steve Mangus: interesting going over the map. Don't want to see a stamping plant. Covered a lot of things. There has been a fundamental dishonesty in the past by the township. People had no input on what was going on. People still have scars and we have to deal with the ramifications - people felt slighted. I can see it from both sides. Lie by omission. Work for the people of the township. Try to keep the process as open as possible. Link: Vaughn said there is no proof that there was dishonesty. I don't see a lot of people here. To Steve Mangus: your opinion is that they have been dishonest. We are going to heal these wounds by debating and debating and not make any progress? You cannot make people come here. Steve Mangus: feels that people have not felt comfortable and didn't feel that they were being listened to. Kim

Mangus: The research of the 5 acre minimum ruling found that it was not what anyone thought it was. We are not going to make everyone happy.

Zakrajsek: We will try to keep an open format. Discussion rather than dictation.

Motion to adjourn at 9:20 p.m. by Boyd , seconded by Lyons. MOTION CARRIED.

Tabled Items: Non-conformities; Permitted and Special Uses; Camp Site Plan Request; Essential Services