

MINUTES
Homestead Inland Joint Planning Commission
Homestead Township Hall
~~March 18~~ **April 16, 2014**

1.) Call to Order

Meeting was called to order by Chair Lehn at 7:02 PM.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Roll Call: Dan Moore, Fred Poyner, Sean Lehn, Roger Hubbell, Richard Fast, Cathy Demitroff, Christy Andersen, and Mary Miller were present. Dale Jeske was absent.

Other Staff present: Roger Williams, Zoning Administrator and Sara Kopriva, Recording Secretary.

There were 21 members of the public present.

2.) Agenda

Motion by Miller and seconded by Hubbell to approve the agenda with addition of Payment of Vouchers under New Business. Motion carried unanimously.

3.) Approval of Minutes

Motion by Demitroff and seconded by Poyner to approve the minutes as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

4.) Public Input

Public input was opened at 7:08 PM. The Chair read the rules aloud. There was no public input.

5.) Close Public Input: at 7:11 PM

6.) New Business:

a. Sketch Plan Review for Fresh Wind Christian Community. Informational Only.

Williams explained the sketch plan review process and that it is an informal discussion. The applicant is looking for any feedback from the Board. Staff report was included in the packet. This property is planned commercial and is currently zoned commercial.

The applicant explained their current situation and desire to move to new location to start a Christian school. There would be an addition to the existing building to provide area for worship. This building would be used for a K-6 school, church offices and worship. Other services that the church currently provides would remain at their Honor location. There was a brief discussion on parking concerns and second access to 31. At this time the Planning Commission did not have any concerns with the proposal.

b. Site Plan Review to use Starlite Motel as Single Family Dwelling.

Williams gave background and provided staff report in packet. This property is planned commercial and zoned commercial. The zoning district allows for single family dwellings with site plan review. All the property around this site is zoned residential.

The applicant explained that he would like to remodel to have a home on the site and a couple of apartments in the future. At this time he is only asking for the one home. The house is located on the East side of the building.

The application was found to be complete.

The Board went through the Criteria for Review and Finding of Facts:

1. That there is proper relationship between the existing streets and highways within the vicinity and proposed deceleration lanes, service drives, entrance and exit driveways and parking areas to assure the safety and convenience of pedestrian and vehicular traffic, and that the proposed streets and access plan conforms to any street or access plan adopted by the Townships or the County Road Commission.

Roll call: Miller-yes, they already exist; Moore – yes; Demitroff – yes; Lehn – yes; Poyner – yes; Andersen – yes; Hubbell – yes; Fast – abstain

2. That the buildings, structures and entryways thereto proposed to be located upon the premises are so situated and designed as to minimize adverse effects therefrom upon owner and occupants of adjacent properties and the neighborhood.

Roll call: Miller-yes; Moore – yes; Demitroff – yes; Lehn – yes; Poyner – yes; Andersen – yes; Hubbell – yes; Fast – abstain

3. That as many natural features of the landscape shall be retained as possible, particularly, where they furnish a barrier or buffer between the project and adjoining properties used for dissimilar purposes and where they assist in preserving the general appearance of the neighborhood or help control erosion or the discharge of storm waters.

Roll call: Miller-yes; Moore – yes; Demitroff – yes; Lehn – yes; Poyner – yes; Andersen – yes; Hubbell – yes; Fast – abstain

4. That any adverse effects of the proposed development and activities proceeding here from upon adjoining residents or owners shall be minimized by appropriate screening, fencing or landscaping.

Roll call: Miller-yes; Moore – yes; Demitroff – yes; Lehn – yes; Poyner – yes; Andersen – yes; Hubbell – yes; Fast – abstain

5. That all provisions of this Ordinance are complied with unless an appropriate variance therefrom has been granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Roll call: Miller-yes; Moore – yes; Demitroff – yes; Lehn – yes; Poyner – yes; Andersen – yes; Hubbell – yes; Fast – abstain

6. That all buildings and structures are accessible to emergency vehicles.

Roll call: Miller-yes; Moore – yes; Demitroff – yes; Lehn – yes; Poyner – yes; Andersen – yes; Hubbell – yes; Fast – abstain

7. That the plan as approved is consistent:

a.) To encourage the use of lands in accordance with their character and adaptability.

Roll call: Miller-yes; Moore – yes; Demitroff – yes; Lehn – yes; Poyner – yes; Andersen – yes; Hubbell – yes; Fast – abstain

b.) to avoid overcrowding of population.

Roll call: Miller-yes; Moore – yes; Demitroff – yes; Lehn – yes; Poyner – yes; Andersen – yes; Hubbell – yes; Fast – abstain

c.) To lessen congestion on the public roads and streets to reduce hazards to life and property.

Roll call: Miller-yes; Moore – yes; Demitroff – yes; Lehn – yes; Poyner – yes; Andersen – yes; Hubbell – yes; Fast – abstain

d.) To facilitate adequate provisions for a system of transportation, sewage disposal, safe and adequate water supply, education, recreation and other public requirements.

Roll call: Miller-yes; Moore – yes; Demitroff – yes; Lehn – yes; Poyner – yes; Andersen – yes; Hubbell – yes; Fast – abstain

e.) To conserve the expenditure of funds for public improvements and services to conform with the most advantageous uses of land, resources and properties.

Roll call: Miller-yes; Moore – yes; Demitroff – yes; Lehn – yes; Poyner – yes; Andersen – yes; Hubbell – yes; Fast – abstain

f.) To preserve property values and natural resources.

Roll call: Miller-yes; Moore – yes; Demitroff – yes; Lehn – yes; Poyner – yes; Andersen – yes; Hubbell – yes; Fast – abstain

g.) To give consideration to the character of a particular area, its peculiar suitability for particular uses and the general and appropriate trend and character of land, building and population development.

Roll call: Miller-yes; Moore – yes; Demitroff – yes; Lehn – yes; Poyner – yes; Andersen – yes; Hubbell – yes; Fast – abstain

8. That a plan for erosion controls and storm water discharge has been approved by appropriate public officials.

Not applicable

Motion by Andersen and seconded by Miller to approve this site plan as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

c. Site Plan Review for Walts Smokehouse for home based business.

Williams provided background and staff report was included in the packet. This is to move a business into a home and home based businesses are allowed with Site Plan Review. This property is zoned mixed residential which allows for commercial and residential mix.

The applicant is downsizing and restructuring business. The hours will be Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. There would be limited retail on the site mostly delivering product to commercial users. There is no dumpster on site and regular garbage totes will be used. The smokehouse will be constructed and the stack will be higher than the houses. There will be no employees and no additional lighting.

There was discussion about the amount of smoke produced and site plan.

The topic was opened for public comment.

Elaine Saffron-Concerned about smell and traffic

Marilyn Steer- Concerned about smell, currently already lots of smoke and smell.

There was discussion about mobile smokers and those would not be utilized on the site except for family events.

Kevin Moore- House is located in valley and on blind corner. Slaughtering should not be allowed.

The application was found to be complete.

The Board went through the Criteria for Review and Finding of Facts:

1. That there is proper relationship between the existing streets and highways within the vicinity and proposed deceleration lanes, service drives, entrance and exit driveways and parking areas to assure the safety and convenience of pedestrian and vehicular traffic, and that the proposed streets and access plan conforms to any street or access plan adopted by the Townships or the County Road Commission.

Roll call: Miller-yes,; Moore – yes; Demitroff – yes; Lehn – yes; Poyner – yes; Andersen – yes, existing drive; Hubbell – yes; Fast – yes

2. That the buildings, structures and entryways thereto proposed to be located upon the premises are so situated and designed as to minimize adverse effects therefrom upon owner and occupants of adjacent properties and the neighborhood.

Roll call: Miller-yes with conditions; Moore – yes; Demitroff – yes with conditions; Lehn – yes; Poyner – yes; Andersen – yes; Hubbell – yes; Fast – yes with conditions

3. That as many natural features of the landscape shall be retained as possible, particularly, where they furnish a barrier or buffer between the project and adjoining properties used for dissimilar purposes and where they assist in preserving the general appearance of the neighborhood or help control erosion or the discharge of storm waters.

Roll call: Miller-yes; Moore – yes; Demitroff – yes; Lehn – yes; Poyner – yes; Andersen – yes; Hubbell – yes; Fast – yes

4. That any adverse effects of the proposed development and activities proceeding here from upon adjoining residents or owners shall be minimized by appropriate screening, fencing or landscaping.

Roll call: Miller-yes with conditions; Moore – yes; Demitroff – yes with conditions; Lehn – yes with conditions; Poyner – yes with conditions; Andersen – yes; Hubbell – yes with conditions; Fast – yes

5. That all provisions of this Ordinance are complied with unless an appropriate variance therefrom has been granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Discussion about standards in Zoning Ordinance. This does cause smoke but is similar to wood boilers in the area.

Roll call: Miller-yes; Hubbell – no because of standards; Moore –no because of standards; Poyner – no because of standards;
Fast called for the vote
Lehn – yes with conditions; Andersen – yes; Demitroff – no; Fast – no (5 No, 3 Yes)

6. That all buildings and structures are accessible to emergency vehicles.

Roll call: Miller-yes; Moore – yes; Demitroff – yes; Lehn – yes; Poyner – yes; Andersen – yes; Hubbell – yes; Fast – yes

7. That the plan as approved is consistent:

a.) To encourage the use of lands in accordance with their character and adaptability.

Roll call: Miller-yes; Moore – yes; Demitroff – yes; Lehn – yes; Poyner – yes; Andersen – yes; Hubbell – yes; Fast – yes

b.) to avoid overcrowding of population.

Roll call: Miller-yes; Moore – yes; Demitroff – yes; Lehn – yes; Poyner – yes; Andersen – yes; Hubbell – yes; Fast – yes

c.) To lessen congestion on the public roads and streets to reduce hazards to life and property.

Not Applicable

d.) To facilitate adequate provisions for a system of transportation, sewage disposal, safe and adequate water supply, education, recreation and other public requirements.

Not Applicable

e.) To conserve the expenditure of funds for public improvements and services to conform with the most advantageous uses of land, resources and properties.

Not Applicable

f.) To preserve property values and natural resources.

Roll call: Miller-yno; Moore – yes; Demitroff – yes; Lehn – no; Poyner – yes; Andersen – yes; Hubbell – yes; Fast – yes (6 yes, 2 No)

g.) To give consideration to the character of a particular area, its peculiar suitability for particular uses and the general and appropriate trend and character of land, building and population development.

Roll call: Miller-yes with conditions; Moore – yes with conditions; Demitroff – yes with conditions; Lehn – yes with conditions; Poyner – yes with conditions; Andersen –no; Hubbell – yes with conditions; Fast – yes with conditions

8. That a plan for erosion controls and storm water discharge has been approved by appropriate public officials.

Not applicable

There was discussion of conditions and that this use would produce less smoke than wood boilers in the area.

Motion by Miller and seconded by Fast to approve this site plan with conditions.

1. Smokehouse moved further away from neighbors to North side of garage.
2. Appropriate screening of smokehouse from road.
3. No on site slaughtering, no process of animals.
4. Use of mobile smoker to be limited and moved to area as remote as possible.

Motion by Demitroff and seconded by Miller to amend condition #2 to say No on site slaughtering of animals or fish. Motion carried unanimously.

Vote on original motion with amended conditions #2. Motion carried unanimously.

d. Payment of Vouchers

Motion by Miller and seconded by Andersen to pay vouchers. Motion carried unanimously.

7.) Old Business

a. Larry Koon Status

Williams contacted and notified Koon of conditions. Have not heard or seen an additional information.

8.) Reports

a. Homestead Twp Board – Dan Moore

Approved budget. Clean up on May 17. Receiving bids for moving cemetery and concession stand.

b. Inland Twp Board report – Mary Miller

Township clean up is May 3. Approved budget. Advertising for fire chief, assistant chief, and medical director. Provided articles on fracking.

c. Zoning Administrator

Activity has increase.

9.) Open Public Discussion:

Elaine Saffron asked about the process for site plan review

Williams explained the process and that a site plan review does not require a public hearing and not notices are required.

10.) Close Public Discussion

11.) Planners Moments:

Postponed to next meeting

12.) Board go around, discussion/announcements

Would like to review Zoning Ordinance about smoke requirements in home based businesses.

13.) Adjourn

Motion by Miller and seconded by Moore to adjourn the meeting at 9:36 PM. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectively submitted by Sara Kopriva