



DEXTER TOWNSHIP

PLANNING COMMISSION

6880 DEXTER-PINCKNEY ROAD
DEXTER, MI 48130
TELEPHONE: 734-426-3767
FAX: 734-426-3833
WWW.TWP-DEXTER.ORG

TOM LEWIS
CHAIR
TOM EHMAN,
VICE CHAIR
MARY ADAMS,
SECRETARY
BILL GAJEWSKI,
TWP.BRD. REP.
MARTY RUHLIG
BOB NESTER
JEFFREY DEHRING
COMMISSIONERS

KIMBERLY JORDAN,
RECORDING SECRETARY

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION Wednesday, May 14, 2014

Present: Tom Ehman, Vice- Chair; Mary Adams, Secretary; Bill Gajewski, Township Board Representative; Marty Ruhlig; Bob Nester and Jeffrey Dehring.

Also present: James Drolett, Supervisor; Zach Michels, Director of Planning ([DPZ](#)) and Zoning, and Kimberly Jordan, Recording Secretary.

Absent: Lewis (with notice)

7:00 PM, Ehman, Vice Chair, called the special meeting to order.

~~[\(14-PC-158\) Copper Meadows.](#)~~

Ehman asked if the public had any comments or concerns on a non-agenda item. No public comments were received.

~~Hearing no public comments, we will move forward to the consideration of the site plan review.~~

~~[\(14-PC-158\) Copper Meadows](#)~~

Ehman stated that the applicant is requesting ~~for~~ changes to an approved site plan. Lot numbers four (4), Forty (40), seventeen (17), and the walkway between lots numbers five (5) and six (6). Ehman asked Michels to address the public and explain the specific changes.

Michels gave an overview of his staff report (14-PC-158) Copper Meadows, dated May 9, 2014, highlighting ~~on~~ the four specific changes being requested by the applicant.

Michels noted that the changes being requested are considered major changes and will require Planning Commission review and approval. Additionally, the requested changes are subject to findings in 6.07(A) (1) of the Dexter Township Ordinance.

Ehman asked if the applicant would like to add anything to Michels overview.

Mr. Guenther replied no.

Ehman asked the commissioners if they had any comments and/or concerns.

Dehring asked what the reason was for the foundation set back discrepancies on lots four and forty.

Michels explained that lot forty was inspected in the winter months which made it impossible to verify measurements and lot four was never called for a footing inspection.

Dehring asked, if it is not the developers obligation to ensure the placement of ~~lot measurements~~ foundation of required setbacks:-

Michels, replied yes. It is also the developer's responsibility to call for those inspections.

Ehman stated that the records show that there were mistakes made and possibly even a history of mistakes. He stated that the purpose of tonight's hearing is to try and decide a possible resolution to those mistakes and to enforce the Zoning Ordinance on behalf of the public and for the consideration of health safety and welfare for everyone involved.

Ehman asked the public to keep in mind when addressing the Commission how these amendment changes could adversely impact them. We are here tonight for resolve, not to punish or berate the township and/or applicant.

Ehman opened the floor for public comment.

- 1) Beth Filip, Patina, Dexter, Lot 2- Stated that she is non-conforming by not meeting the front fifty (50) foot setback. Selling could be a problem and her State Equalized Value (SEV) could also be affected. She is in support of the lot amendments across the board so that all lots conform. She added that the applicant needs to address the road and drainage issues and suggest the consideration of creating a "Bond" to insure those issue are cleared up.

She has concerns that if these issues are not addressed the burden will fall back on the property owners and they would be possible looking at another assessment. A bond would be the preface and benefit to the community. Another major issue for the community is the safety of egress and ingress to common area.

- 2) Cary Grimm, Sterling Trail, Dexter, Lot 43 – Stated that every lot affects the homeowners association. We need assurance set in place and our roads repaired.
- 3) Andy Reiser, Sterling Trail, Dexter, Lot 22- Stated that the community wants to move forward and resolve these issues. However, there are concerns about the visual aesthetics of front yard setbacks staggering from 35, 40, 45, and 50 feet. He stated that this is not visually appealing. Additionally, he agrees with Filip that the applicant needs to bring into compliance the sewer area, roads, and the common areas that is for the community and enjoyed by the community.

Reiser stated that back in December, the Township required the applicant to put up "silt/silt fences" around all new construction. In his view, that is not being done and/or inspected. He is not here tonight to point fingers just looking for ~~insurance~~ reassurances of resolve and compliance.

Gajewski commented that the reduced set-back from 50 to 35 is a good thing for a couple of reasons. The decrease in the length of driveways and reduced impervious surfaces, support fewer ~~run-offs~~. Additionally, studies show that closer walkways homes closer to the street protects water quality ~~encourage~~ encouraging community social interaction.

Dehring inquired about erosion control placement and its monitoring.

Michels explained the current erosion policy which is in place.

- 4) Dan Trevisan, Sterling Trail, Dexter, Lot 8 – Stated he does not support the 35 foot set-back and states that the Township needs to set a precedence. He is concerned about the aesthetics of the community and the affect it could have on the property values.
- 5) Brad Whitehood, Sterling Trail, Dexter, Lot 5 – Stated he e is aware that these setback issues are of no fault to Guenther as it was inherited with the property as built. He does not think the 50 foot setback should be removed from all the lots. Proper measurements and compliance for lots four and forty should be re-surveyed and corrected.
- 6) Tracy & Trevor Brewster, Ann Arbor, Lot 4 – Stated that they are living in the basement of their parents' home due to mortgage concerns because their setbacks are non-conforming. They are in support of the amendment and ask the commissioners to consider approval so they can obtain their certificate of occupancy.

Ehman thanked the public for their input and comments. The commissioners will now deliberate and discuss the resolution.

Michels stated that throughout the public comment period he took note of public comments and concerns and compiled an additional list of conditions for the Planning Commission's consideration to add to the resolution. Michels distributed a copy to the Commissioners and the public.

Open dialog between the commissioners and public ensued addressing the additional "i" through "u" conditions.

Drolett suggested the four vacant lots be amended to 40 foot setbacks and no-less than 40 feet moving forward.

Commissioners worked their way through Michels draft resolution (14-PC-158) Copper Meadows, dated May 9, 2014. Amendments were made, current dates inserted, and the language for the reasoning of the whereas for items 180, 190, 200, 210 and 220.

Motion by Nester, supported by Ruhlig, to approve as amended (14-PC-158) Copper Meadows resolution for an amended Site Plan.

Call Vote:

Yes – Adams, Dehring, Ehman, Gajewski, Nester and Ruhlig

No – None

Absent – Lewis

Abstain – None.

Motion Carried 6-0.

***DPZ** Michels staff report, amended approved resolution, and all other supporting documents regarding the above agenda item can be obtained at the Township Hall during normal business hours. Additionally, these documents are available on the Townships website: www.twp-dexter.org*

I. Concerns of Commission Members, Director of Planning and Zoning, Supervisor, and Recording Secretary- None

II. Public Comment – None

III. Adjournment – Ehman declared meeting adjourned at 9:30 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Kimberly Jordan, Recording Secretary

Mary Adams, Secretary