

Lake Township, Huron County
Planning Commission Regular Meeting
Wednesday, January 26, 2022

~~Unapproved Minutes~~
Approved Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 7:05PM. Planning Commission members in attendance were Bob Siver, Keith Hoffman, Tim Lalley, Nicole Collins and Tim Quinn. There were four guests. Dave Robinson in person, Mark Anderson, Alicia Tatham (applicants) and Mark Eiselson of Landplan virtually. This meeting was conducted at the Community Room of the Caseville City/Township Hall, 6767 Main Street, Caseville, MI 48725 and virtually through gotomeeting.com.

Motion by Hoffman, second by Lalley to approve the agenda. All ayes, motion carried.

Motion by Collins, second by Hoffman to approve the December 8, 2021, minutes. All ayes, motion carried.

Public Comment: Dave Robinson. Pleased with seeing the utilization of the blight officer. Questions about utility easement regulations.

Correspondence: Building Permit report for December 2021; Zoning Report for December 2021; Land Use Permit report for December 2021; December 31, 2021, from Landplan re: Proposed PUD Application.

New Business: None

Old Business: Proposed PUD Lavender Farm: December 31, 2021, correspondence from Landplan re: Proposed PUD Application.

The Planning Commission's recommendations to the Township Board for a PUD application must be a report to the Township Board stating its conclusions and recommendation, the basis for its decision, and any recommended conditions relating to an affirmative decision, as per Section 4.6 Procedure for Review and Approval B-3 of the Zoning Ordinance #2020-4, adopted November 16, 2020. As this information was not included in their December 2021 recommendation to the Board of Trustees, Mark Eidelson of Landplan was given over facilitation of the meeting by Chairman Siver in order to gather the needed information and will create a "draft" of the report required by the zoning ordinance for the Planning Commission's review.

Pursuant to his correspondence of December 31, 2021 via email with Planning Commission, Mark Eidelson began conducting the PUD application recommendations.

Review Standards for Tatham/Anderson PUD Application

Part 1: Minimum Eligibility (Sec. 4.3)

1. **Recognizable and Substantial Benefit:** A business will be established where land has been vacant for many years and the use of the property will benefit the community.
2. **Availability and Capacity of Public Services:** The proposal does not increase or decrease any of the public services or utilities so therefore does not create a negative impact.
3. **Compatibility with Master Plan:** The proposal falls within the goals and policies of the Master Plan as a whole. Since this is a new approach for the Township, upon approval all three areas in this PUD should be looked at in conjunction with the Master Plan.
4. **Compatibility with the PUD Intent:** The proposal is consistent with the intent and spirit of Section 4.1 of the Zoning Ordinance. The applicants have provided all the information required. Proposal completely meets all provisions of Section 4.1.
5. **Economic Impact:** A positive economic impact is foreseen as a vacant piece of property will be cleaned up and redeveloped. A new business will bring people into the area. No negative impact is foreseen for surrounding properties as the lavender farm will not be dealing in harmful products or waste.
6. **Unified Control of the Property:** The property deed takes care of this item.

Part 2: Site Plan Approval Standards (Sec. 14.4)

1. **Site Organization:** The Planning Commission has asked the applicants to include additional overflow parking. The site plan currently has 13 designated parking spaces. It is suggested that an additional area west of the last parking space can be kept open for overflow parking should the PC deem it necessary.
2. **District Proposal:** Addressed in Part 1.
3. **Surrounding Properties:** Addressed in Part 1.
4. **Environmental Character:** There will be no tree removal, no woodlands to disturb, soil will be maintained for the planting and growing of lavender, topography will remain the same and no water courses or wetlands to contend with. Therefore, no negative environmental impact is foreseen.
5. **Stormwater Management:** The site plan shows very little additional impervious surfaces that would increase storm water runoff. The soils are sandy which helps to manage stormwater.
6. **Circulation:** The site plan addresses all the traffic circulation issues specified. It has proper ingress and egress for the property.

7. **Utilities:** The well and septic have been inspected. DTE provides electric from a pole across the street, underground to the property.
8. **Phasing:** There will be no phasing of this project.
9. **Other:** Nothing additional to address.

Part 3: Special Land Use Approval Standards (Sec. 15.6)

1. **Application shall be consistent with the Master Plan:** Previously discussed. Nothing additional to include.
2. **Application will be consistent with the purpose of the zoning district in which it is located:** Previously discussed. Nothing additional to include.
3. **The proposed facility shall be compatible with the existing and planned character of the vicinity:** The plans flow well and appear to be compatible overall.
4. **The proposed facility shall be served adequately by essential public facilities and services:** Previously discussed. Nothing additional to include.
5. **The proposed facility shall not require excessive additional public facilities/services requirements at public cost:** Previously discussed. Nothing additional to include.
6. **The proposed facility shall not be hazardous, disturbing or detrimental to the use, peaceful enjoyment, economic value or development of the neighboring property, or the vicinity in general:** The Planning Commission is comfortable with the PUD application and has no concerns about this item.
7. **The proposed facility shall not involve uses, activities, processes, materials and equipment or conditions of operation that will be detrimental to the natural environment:** The Planning Commission is comfortable with the PUD application and has no concerns about this item.
8. **The proposed facility shall be compatible with the existing and planned character of the vicinity:** The plans flow well and appear to be compatible overall.
9. **The proposed facility shall be served adequately by essential public facilities and services:** Previously discussed. Nothing additional to include.
10. **The proposed facility shall not require excessive additional public facilities/services requirements at public cost:** Previously discussed. Nothing additional to include.
11. **The proposed facility shall not be hazardous, disturbing or detrimental to the use, peaceful enjoyment, economic value or development of the neighboring property, or the vicinity in general:** The Planning Commission is comfortable with the PUD application and has no concerns about this item.
12. **The proposed facility shall not involve uses, activities, processes, materials and equipment or conditions of operation that will be detrimental to the natural environment:** The Planning Commission is comfortable with the PUD application and has no concerns about this item.

The zoning ordinance requires parking lots to have landscaping as screening to preserve the naturalness of the area. In this case there is approximately 200' of wooded area to the south of the proposed parking area. This land is owned by the neighbor to the south. As a condition, should this area be cleared in the future, the applicants will then be required to install the proper screening as specified in the zoning ordinance Section 11.5.

Crops grown will be a minimum of ½ of the acreage devoted to the cultivation of lavender and other plant types will be allowed that are commonly found in flower gardens. This is in accordance with Option 3 which was included in an email correspondence between Mark Eidelson and Nicole Collins. The Planning Commission agrees.

Mark Eidelson will prepare a draft motion and report for the Planning Commission which they will discuss at their February meeting.

The Planning Commission would like to move this application on to the Board of Trustees. A motion was made by Collins, second by Hoffman to move the February 2022 regular meeting to Wednesday, February 16, 2022, at 6:00PM. All ayes, motion carried.

Public Comment: None

Adjourn: There being no further business, motion by Collins, second by Hoffman to adjourn. All ayes, motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 9:00PM.

Minutes prepared by:
Maryanne Williams,
Deputy Clerk