



Dexter Township

planning commission

6880 Dexter-Pinckney Road
Dexter, MI 48130

Telephone: 734-426-3767
Fax: 734-426-3833

www.twp-dexter.org

John Shea,
Chair
Ken Tappe,
Vice Chair
Vickie Kooyers
Twp. Brd. rep.
Mary Adams
Secretary
James Korcek
Molly Wade
Tom Lewis
Commissioners
Kim Jordan,
Recording Secretary

REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION Tuesday, June 10, 2008 7:00 PM

Present: John Shea, Chair; Ken Tappe, Vice Chair; Vickie Kooyers, Township Board Representative; Mary Adams, Secretary; James Korcek and Tom Lewis.

Also present: Patrick Sloan, Director of Planning and Zoning.

Absent: Molly Wade.

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM.

I. Approval of Agenda - Motion by Lewis, supported by Tappe, to approve agenda as submitted.
Carried 6-0.

II. Approval of the Minutes - Motion by Tappe, supported by Kooyers, to approve the minutes of May 27, 2008 as amended. **Carried 6-0.**

III. Public Comment - None

IV. Action Items -

1) Public Hearing for Zoning Ordinance Amendments 34-6-

Shea opened the meeting for public comment at 7:05 P.M.

Shaun Murray, 179 Little Lake Dr., Ann Arbor – Noted that he was here tonight on behalf of the Home Builders Association and is in support of the developers in their opposition to any changes to section 6.04 (H), (#12; Expiration of Final Site Plan Approval). He stated the following concerns that they would like the Planning Commission to reconsider:

- He said they are concerned that there is no grandfather clause for the extension of final site plans that addresses previously approved final site plans.
- He stated that, a one year drop-dead time for extensions are too short, taking into consideration of the current economic climate.
- The language in the second sentence of section 6.04 (H) “diligently pursued to completion” needs to be better defined. It lacks clarity.
- If an extension were granted to a developer, it should be governed by the conditions set forth in the approved original final site plan and not new conditions.
- Finally, he noted that, the builders association and developers would preferably like the Zoning Ordinance to stay as it is currently written with no amendments, such as section 6.04 (H).

Tappe stated that he did not believe the intent of the proposed amendment is to change an approved final site plan after one year.

Korcek commented that he believes there should be a drop-dead expiration date implemented for the commencement of a development. He said that other county and government agencies have expiration dates and that a two-year extension would not be unreasonable. Extensions should be granted where warranted and should be limited

Lewis commented that he agrees with the developer. After Planning Commission review and if an extension is granted it should be governed by the original site plan approval conditions, not new ones.

Jack Campbell, P.O. Box 649, Pinckney – Stated that his major complaint is with the right to request an extension and its proposed drop-dead date. He doesn't feel that previously approved developments, Hanover Glen, Hartman Farm, Starhill and West Lake Hills, which he noted for the record should be governed by the proposed amendments. He wants these approved developments to be regulated under the Zoning Ordinance current text. He and the other developers are opposed to a twenty four month drop-dead date that would adversely affect them, given the current economic conditions. Campbell pointed out numerous text edits throughout the amendments that he felt needed to be better defined and/or given more clarification.

Howard Joll, 8596 Portage Blvd., Pinckney – Commented on the revised section 19.02(A)(1), regarding nonconforming uses, lots, and structures. He disagrees with this provision of the ordinance and believes that property owners should have the right to buy and sell contiguous lots, regardless of the area of the lots.

Shea said that this was a valued concern but that the provision is not anew part of the 34-6 amendments that are before the members this evening. The amendment for this section was only for the word "frontage" to be inserted. Shea suggested to Mr. Joll that he submit his concerns in writing and/or speak with Patrick for the consideration for future proposed revisions to the Zoning Ordinance.

No additional questions or comments. Shea closed the public hearing at 8:04 P.M.

Motion by Tappe, supported by Korcek, to table Zoning Ordinance Amendments 34-6, for further discussion at the Planning Commission's next scheduled work session, July 8, 2008. **Carried 6-0.**

2) Review of the Master Plan –

Shea asked Sloan if he could somehow flag and/or track his revisions to the draft Master Plan, to better help the members track the changes throughout their review process.

Shea stated that the members are very appreciative of Sloan's diligent and thorough work that he has put in to the Master Plan. However, they need a little more time to digest the changes and review the text before commenting this evening. The members will focus on chapters five and six and be prepared to discuss and voice their comments at the next scheduled work session.

Shea asked the members what their thoughts were on SEMCOG'S projected figures on the future growth of Dexter Township. He said that he thought they were unrealistic and questioned if they should be included in the Master Plan or whether the plan should emphasize that the projected figures of future growth are merely an estimate.

Sloan will review and the members will discussed further at their next scheduled work session.

V. Township Board Up-Date - None

VI. Concerns of Commission Members, Director of Planning and Zoning, Supervisor, and Recording Secretary-

Tappe informed the members that he was considering supporting a provision to section 17.05 for grandfathering final site plan approvals for those developments that have been previously approved. He said that, due to our current economic conditions, the developers have been posed with extenuating circumstances and conditions. Additionally, he believes that the four site developments that would be the only ones to fall under this grandfather clause are reputable business people in the community and have had viable negotiations and commitments with the planning commission for the approval of their site plans.

Kooyers noted that the Planning Commission by-laws, Article V., Section 1 needs to be amended so that it is in compliance with the change in dates for the planning commission working session. They now meet on the second Tuesday of the month instead of the first Tuesday which is currently stated in the by-laws.

Sloan said that he will be drafting an amendment to the by-laws which will include the new zoning enabling act revision and, the work session amendment as well.

Korcek asked if the Zoning Board of Appeals has submitted their list of issues and concerns that they wanted the Planning Commissioners to consider in their next batch of zoning amendments.

Sloan replied, not yet. He will seek comment from the ZBA.

VII. Public Comment – None

VIII. Future Agenda Items -

Tuesday, June 24, 2008

- 1) Review Verizon Site Plan Application
- 2) Review Dexter Dental Site Plan

Tuesday, July 8, 2008 – Work Session

- 1) Review Zoning Ordinance Amendments 34-6
- 2) Review Master Plan
- 3) Amendments to the PC By-Laws

IX. Adjournment – Shea, Chair, declared meeting adjourned at 8:40 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Kimberly Jordan, Recording Secretary

Mary Adams, Secretary