

MELROSE TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
MELROSE TOWNSHIP HALL

SPECIAL MEETING OF DECEMBER 19, 2022

I. Call to Order/Roll Call

- A. Call to Order: Chair Bart Wangeman called the meeting to order at 5:33 PM.
- B. Members present: Bart Wangeman, Julie Christy, Dan Nowland, and Tim LaGasse.
- C. Members absent: Charley Zimmer.
- D. Staff present: Zoning Administrator Ken Lane.

II. Approval of Agenda

By consensus the agenda was approved as presented.

III. Approval of Minutes

Chair Wangeman asked the Planning Commission if any corrections were needed to the draft October 24 meeting minutes.

Zoning Administrator Lane stated that Member Zimmer had contacted him and let him know that Mr. Philo Lang's name was spelled incorrectly. The Planning Commission agreed the misspelled name needed correction.

Member Christy motioned to approve the October 24, 2022, draft minutes with amendments as presented, seconded by Member LaGasse, the motion was approved unanimously.

IV. New Business

1. Site Plan Review—02594 Springvale Road

Chair Wangeman opened the review for the Planning Commission and stated that a development plan had been submitted for the addition of two classroom buildings on the campus of Bear River Health. Chair Wangeman noted that neither the applicant nor a representative of Bear River Health was in attendance.

Zoning Administrator Lane stated that a copy of the Planning Commission meeting packet and agenda had been sent to the applicant, Frederick Hackl, on December 12, 2022, by email. He further added that Mr. Hackl had responded to the email verifying his receipt of the packet.

The Planning Commission agreed by consensus to proceed with development plan review despite the applicant not being in attendance.

Chair Wangeman referred to Zoning Administrator Lane's memo included in the Planning Commission meeting packet. Chair Wangeman went through the Zoning Ordinance review sections of the memo noting that Zoning Administrator Lane found that the submitted development plan complied with Sections 6.4 (B), 6.4 (D), 6.4 (E), and 6.4 (F) of the Township Zoning Ordinance. The Planning Commission members by consensus stated they did agree with the staff findings in relation to Sections 6.4 (B), 6.4 (D), 6.4 (E), and 6.4 (F) as provided in the memo.

Chair Wangeman stated that the requirements of Section 6.4 (G) of the Township Zoning Ordinance had only been partially satisfied, because the submitted development plan did not meet all the graphic requirements and development standards under the Township Zoning Ordinance. A consensus of the Planning Commission agreed with Chair Wangeman.

Chair Wangeman referred to Zoning Administrator Lane's memo noting that parking areas as depicted on the development plan satisfied Zoning Ordinance Section 8.2.

Chair Wangeman asked Zoning Administrator Lane if two parking spaces designated for loading areas satisfied Section 8.3 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Zoning Administrator responded yes, two parking spaces meet the Zoning Ordinance requirements.

The Planning Commission members by consensus agreed with the staff findings in relation to Sections 8.2 and 8.3 as provided in the memo.

Chair Wangeman stated that Zoning Administrator Lane's memo found that the graphic requirements of Sections 11.1 (A) (2) (a), (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g) of the Township Zoning Ordinance were satisfied by the submitted development plan. He offered that he agreed with the staff findings in relation to those graphic requirements and asked the Planning Commission if they also agreed.

The Planning Commission members by consensus stated they did agree with the staff findings in relation to Sections 11.1 (A) (2) (a), (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g) as provided in the memo.

Chair Wangeman suggested that the Planning Commission discuss the requirements of Section 11.1 (A) (2) (b). He added that although the development plan depicted existing topography, it did not depict proposed topography or how drainage will flow across the property in relation to the proposed classrooms. He added that the two proposed classrooms were shown on the development plan in a location that would require stormwater run-off to travel directly through and underneath them.

Chair Wangeman suggested that the submitted development plan did not satisfy the requirements of Section 11.1 (A) (2) (b) of the Zoning Ordinance.

Member LaGasse stated that ice pockets currently form on the property in the area where the classrooms are proposed to be located.

Member Nowland agreed and stated that the development plan needed to depict drainage flow across the entire site, from Springvale Road down. He added that the development plan should more accurately depict drainage structures as well, including manholes.

The Planning Commission members by consensus agreed that the submitted development plan did not comply with Section 11.1 (A) (2) (b).

Chair Wangeman noted that the development plan depicted an area labeled as “proposed parking.” He added that Zoning Administrator Lane mentioned this in his memo and noted that the application materials did not mention added parking.

Because the applicant was not there to respond to questions, the Planning Commission members by consensus agreed that the proposed parking depicted was likely a carryover from a previous plan and that the submitted development plan did comply with Section 11.1 (A) (2) (h).

The Planning Commission members by consensus agreed that the submitted development plan partially complied with Sections 11.1 (A) (2) (i), and (j), but additional information was needed to accurately show emergency vehicle access and loading and unloading areas.

The Planning Commission members by consensus agreed that the submitted development plan partially complied with Section 11.1 (A) (2) (k), but additional information was needed to accurately depict sidewalks, walkways and how pedestrians will move across the property and access the proposed classrooms.

The Planning Commission members by consensus agreed that the submitted development plan partially complied with Section 11.1 (A) (2) (l), but additional information was needed to show drainage across the property to the retention ponds, especially with the addition of the two proposed classrooms.

The Planning Commission members by consensus stated they did agree with the staff findings in relation to Sections 11.1 (A) (2) (m), (n), and (o) as provided in the memo from the Zoning Administrator, and that those sections were satisfied by the submitted development plan.

The Planning Commission members by consensus agreed that the submitted development plan partially complied with Section 11.1 (A) (2) (p), but additional information was needed to accurately depict lighting on the property.

The Planning Commission members by consensus agreed that the submitted development plan did not comply with Sections 11.1 (A) (2) (q), (r), and (s), because screening devices and buffering landscaping were not depicted in relation to the proposed classrooms.

The Planning Commission members by consensus stated they did agree with the staff findings in relation to Sections 11.1 (A) (2) (t), (u), (v), and (w) as provided in the memo from the Zoning Administrator and that those sections were not applicable or were satisfied by the submitted development plan.

Chair Wangeman suggested that the Planning Commission go through each of the development plan review standards listed in Section 11.4 of the Township Zoning Ordinance.

Chair Wangeman read aloud Section 11.4 (A) (1) and offered that the submitted development plan did not show how the proposed classroom locations were harmonious with the site because the topography was not accurately depicted adjacent to the classrooms. He added the development plan did not provide enough information to determine whether Section 11.4 (A) (1) can be satisfied.

Member LaGasse agreed and stated the proposed modular classrooms are inconsistent with the existing building types on the property and that the location of the proposed classroom foundations did not seem like an organized location for the property. He added that the submitted development plan did not satisfy Section 11.4 (A) (1) of the Zoning Ordinance.

The Planning Commission members by consensus stated they agreed that the requirements of Section 11.4 (A) (1) had not been satisfied.

Chair Wangeman read aloud Section 11.4 (A) (2) and offered that the applicant's development plan did not provide enough information to determine whether Section 11.4 (A) (2) can be satisfied. He added without knowing the topography changes across the property, its not possible to make such a determination.

The Planning Commission members by consensus stated they agreed that the requirements of Section 11.4 (A) (2) had not been satisfied.

Chair Wangeman read aloud Section 11.4 (A) (3) and offered that the submitted development plan did not satisfy this standard because topography and drainage were not sufficiently depicted.

The Planning Commission members by consensus agreed that the requirements of Section 11.4 (A) (3) had not been satisfied.

Chair Wangeman read aloud Section 11.4 (A) (4) and stated that the submitted development plan did not provide any information on how the visual and sound privacy of existing residential buildings would be protected or screened from the two proposed classrooms.

Member Christy stated that it was unknown how noisy the proposed classrooms would be.

Member LaGasse stated that he was curious how the proposed classrooms would be used, what their occupancy and staff numbers would be, and whether additional parking would be required to accommodate such use.

Chair Wangeman stated that he had inspected the property, and the residential dwelling units were not accurately depicted, and an existing covered walkway was not shown. He added that he could not tell how the proposed classrooms might impact the residential buildings.

Member LaGasse agreed and stated that the submitted development plan did not accurately depict how people, vehicles, and emergency vehicles would negotiate the property. He added it would be tight to have emergency vehicles maneuver around the proposed classrooms.

The Planning Commission members by consensus agreed that the requirements of Section 11.4 (A) (4) had not been satisfied.

Chair Wangeman read aloud Section 11.4 (A) (5).

Member LaGasse questioned how emergency vehicles would access the proposed classrooms in the locations depicted on the development plan.

Member Christy asked if the concern was for maneuvering between the proposed classrooms and the residential buildings. Member LaGasse responded yes.

The Planning Commission members by consensus agreed that the requirements of Section 11.4 (A) (5) had been partially satisfied, but more information was needed relating to emergency vehicle access.

Chair Wangeman read aloud Section 11.4 (A) (6) and stated that an existing covered walkway was not depicted on the submitted development plan, and that no pedestrian access ways were accurately depicted.

Member LaGasse stated that Sections 11.4 (A) (6) and 11.4 (7) are related, and no sidewalks or pedestrian circulation was depicted on the development plan. He added that the property had vehicle access from US 131 and Springvale Road, so pedestrian access needed to be shown to ensure it will not be impacted by vehicles.

He further added it was not shown how people will access and leave the proposed classrooms, so that they do not encounter vehicle traffic.

The Planning Commission members by consensus agreed that the requirements of Sections 11.4 (A) (6), and (7) had not been satisfied.

Chair Wangeman read aloud Section 11.4 (A) (8) and noted that loading and unloading areas were not shown on the submitted development plan.

The Planning Commission members by consensus agreed that the requirements of Section 11.4 (A) (8) had not been satisfied.

Chair Wangeman read aloud Section 11.4 (A) (9) and offered that the development plan did not accurately depict lighting on the property. He added that no lighting specifications were provided.

The Planning Commission members by consensus agreed that the requirements of Section 11.4 (A) (9) had not been satisfied.

Chair Wangeman read aloud Section 11.4 (A) (10).

The Planning Commission members by consensus agreed that the requirements of Section 11.4 (A) (10) had been satisfied because access from all public roads were surfaced with asphalt.

Chair Wangeman read aloud Section 11.4 (A) (11) and offered that the applicant's development plan satisfied this standard because no street or road changes were being proposed.

The Planning Commission members by consensus stated they agreed that the requirements of Section 11.4 (A) (11) had been satisfied.

Chair Wangeman stated that Zoning Administrator Lane's memo found that Sections 11.4 (A) (12), (13), (14), (15) and (16) were not applicable to the proposed development and he offered that he agreed with those findings.

The Planning Commission members by consensus agreed that the requirements of Sections 11.4 (A) (12), (13), (14), (15) and (16) were not applicable.

Chair Wangeman read aloud Section 11.4 (A) (17).

Zoning Administrator Lane stated that he had distributed the submitted development plan to Charlevoix County officials and had received no response.

Member Nowland questioned if the septic and drain field locations depicted on the submitted development plan were accurate. He added that it was unclear whether the locations shown were existing or proposed.

Chair Wangeman stated that based upon the review by the Planning Commission, the development standards required by Section 11.4 (A) of the Zoning Ordinance were not satisfied.

The Planning Commission considered whether to deny the submitted development plan or postpone a decision to allow the applicant to revise the plan. A consensus of the Planning Commission agreed on postponement.

Member LaGasse moved to postpone a decision on the application submitted by Frederick Hackl, on behalf of Bear River Health, requesting Development Plan Review to add two mobile classrooms at 02594 Springvale Road in Melrose Township, tax parcel 15-010-009-058-25, as shown on the development plan submitted November 14, 2022, until the next regularly scheduled meeting on January 23, 2023, because the graphic requirements and development standards of the Melrose Township Zoning Ordinance have not been satisfied as discussed by the Planning Commission.

Member Nowland seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously by roll call vote.

Zoning Administrator Lane stated that he would notify the applicant and provide him with a detailed list of the needed revisions to the development plan as discussed and decided by the Planning Commission.

V. Unfinished Business

None.

VI. Other Communications/Reports

Zoning Administrator Lane provided copies of an email received from Bob Meek relating to public hearing notification.

A Zoning Administrator report and planning report were provided to the Planning Commission.

VII. Zoning Board of Appeals Report

Chair Wangeman stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals had approved the expansion of a nonconforming use at their November 30, 2022, meeting.

VIII. Planning Commissioner Comments

None.

IX. Citizen Comments on Non-Agenda Items

Bill & Jane Wehrenberg introduced themselves. Bill Wehrenberg stated that the calendar on the Township website showed the Planning Commission meeting being held on December 26 and not December 19. He further added that the Planning Commission should carefully consider the site plan from Bear River Health to ensure that the proposed classrooms will not have an adverse impact on Township resources.

Chair Wangeman apologized for the calendar error on the Township website.

X. Next Meeting Scheduled

January 23, 2023.

Zoning Administrator Lane stated that at this point an amendment to the Vistas of Walloon PUD and an update on the Township Recreation Plan will be on the January, 2023, meeting agenda.

XI. Adjournment

At 6:26 P.M.

Prepared by:

Planning Commission Approval by:

Ken Lane, Zoning Administrator/Recording Sec.

Charley Zimmer, Secretary

Copies: Melrose Township Board, Planning Commission Members, www.melrosetwp.org