

# **Joyfield Township Planning Commission Minutes**

April 17, 2014

1. Call to Order @7:00pm Roll Call – all present except Hayne who was excused.
2. Approval of Agenda – motion by Wood, second by Krueger, motion carried.
3. Public Input for agenda items – heard
4. Minutes from March 20th were read. M Evans made a motion to approve the March minutes. Krueger seconded, motion carried. A correction to the minutes was made during unfinished business. Section 18-8 was corrected to read Building Block 2 page 3.
5. Susan Zenker updated the planning commission on activities of the Benzie County Planning Commission.
6. Unfinished business:

Comments from PC Member Marianne Hayne were reviewed. A letter submitted by Susan and Paula Zenker was read. The commission members reviewed responses to the intergovernmental review comments and to comments submitted by township residents.

  1. MDOT comments regarding M22 were reviewed without response as the highway does not traverse the township. The response was confirmed.
  2. Comments from the Benzie County Planning Commission were reviewed. The comments cover tabs 1,2 & 3, which are relevant to all the municipal governing units, and are not directed to Joyfield Township. Any changes should originate within the L2L leadership Team, The response was confirmed.
  3. Comments from the Benzie County Planning Commission (BCPC) related to Joyfield Township were reviewed.
    1. A lack of renewable energy mention was an expressed concern of the BCPC. The township master plan has been developed around the outcome of the visioning session which did not address renewable energy. The plan is not inconsistent with the county master plan. The response was confirmed
    2. The BCPC encouraged consideration of additional expansion of a commercial area along M115 and US 31. The Planning Commission is inclined to consider expansion as needed. Covering five commercial parcels outside of the current area would draw 84 residential parcels into a commercial zone. There are 7 parcels for sale within the commercial zone at this time. Our five year revision of the Master Plan will address commercial zoning expansion if needed. The township zone closely matches the commercial area of Benzonia Township extending East of US 31. The response was confirmed.
    3. The BCPC recommended adding provisions for “mixed use categories” throughout the township. Land uses within the zoning districts are yet to be determined. The response was confirmed.

4. The BCPC recommended adding provisions for sale or transfer of Agricultural development rights. There is currently not a budget capacity within the township to coordinate this. The planning commission looks favorably upon the transfer of rights to groups such as the Land Conservancy. The Planning commission reviewed the response further along with points from the letter submitted by Susan and Paula Zenker. There is support for the rights of land owners to exercise their options and the planning commission will consider additional options for content in the master plan.
  5. The BCPC recommended inclusion of a “Food Innovation District”. A program exists within L2L to accommodate this need. The response was confirmed.
  6. The BCPC recommended the addition of a glossary. The planning commission would encourage an insertion of a glossary into tabs 1, 2 or 3 of the L2L document. The response was confirmed.
4. Sharon May submitted comments addressing potential concerns of adjoining municipalities and participants in “visioning Sessions”.
- 4.1. The planning commissioners agreed that we should have formal discussions with adjoining communities when we need to rely on commercial, industrial and infrastructure needs. The response was confirmed.
  - 4.2. The planning commissioners acknowledged that we should note for future consideration the participant demographics of visioning sessions and seeking expanded or targeted participation. The response was confirmed.
5. Deb Lindgren had noted an error on total acreage of lakes reported on page 26 of the master plan. - This should be corrected for the decimal error. This acreage may be better defined as surface water. The error noted on page 26 of the master plan will be submitted for correction. Lakes acreage will be removed from the Land Dashboard.
6. Tom Hart expressed concerns for the makeup of the township planning commission and future actions of their efforts. – The comments were noted
7. Tom Hart expressed surprise that after the uproar from county effort to deal with blight issues – the master plan includes a cornerstone on blight. The residents of the township brought up concerns about blight in the visioning session. The response was confirmed.
8. Robert Fitzhugh is concerned about heliport locations not being identified on maps within the master plan. – This is not uncommon when heliports are not used for regularly scheduled passenger traffic. The planning commission will request heliport locations to be noted on the map, page C-32, within tab 2.
9. Tom Hart expressed concerns for land use and restrictions. – The Future Land Use Map is consistent with Benzie County Master Plan and Benzonia Township zoning. The response was confirmed.
10. Gary Gatrell is concerned that an Agriculture Zone is not included in the land use categories of the master plan. – This should not be a problem since agricultural

activity has been discussed as permitted within the “Rural” zone of the township. The response was confirmed.

11. Tom Hart is concerned about the makeup of the planning commission and township board. The comments are noted, but they do not refer to the master plan content. The response was confirmed.
12. Steven Thompson, a resident for a number of years, is concerned that he will now have live within the guidelines of zoning. – Up until 2010 the township was most recently zoned by Benzie County and previously by the township. The response was confirmed.
13. Seth, from Expert Fulfillment is concerned about being located outside of the proposed commercial zone and thus being a “non-conforming” parcel. – The planning Commission would seek to accommodate his needs, but resist “spot zoning” of parcels. State guide lines for non-conforming parcels would need to be adhered to. Since allowable uses within zoning districts have not been addressed, growth potential may not be eliminated. The response was confirmed.
14. Tom Hart “The Lakes to Land Initiative has failed the residents of Joyfield Township and is a complete disappointment.” – The comments are noted, but do not refer to the master plan content. The response was confirmed.
15. Diane Thompson states that property was purchased without zoning in effect and wants no zoning now. The property was owned for a number of years under both township zoning and county zoning. The response was confirmed.
16. Myron Burzynski appreciates the efforts of L2L and the township planning efforts. The planning commission appreciates Myron’s comments.
17. Comments were received from the West Benzie Joint Planning Commission (WBJPC)
  - 17.1. The WBJPC report notes “there appears to be little conflict with goals, policies and implementation for L2L plans and the Benzie County Master Plan adopted by reference by the WBJPC.
  - 17.2. They are concerned that adjacent townships are relying too heavily on no new growth of commercial or industrial uses. – This concern provides an opportunity to collaborate as needed and also work with the county EDC for expanded growth of infrastructure and zoning adjustments. The planning commission is attempting to minimize cross border use conflict by keeping the Commercial Zone in line with Benzonia Township. The response was confirmed.
  - 17.3. Concerns of inconsistencies between Joyfield Township and Benzonia Township should be identified and resolved through collaborative efforts of planning commissions. The response was confirmed.
18. The Blaine Township Planning Commission submitted a comprehensive review of the township master plan and recommendations. NOTE: Responses incorporating changes were under review to the April planning commission meeting.
  - 18.1. Incorporate a statement regarding importance of cornerstones. Response: Add an insert of “Each cornerstone is important to the community, without ranking, and all require consideration when developing policies and

zoning.” into “Expectations”. The noted insert will be inserted into “Expectations”.

- 18.2. Define “co=exist” – will be addressed within the zoning ordinance. The response was confirmed.
- 18.3. Remove “inappropriately” from Building Block 5 page 8. Response: change accordingly. The word “inappropriately will be deleted from Building Block 5 page 8.
- 18.4. Replace “promote” and remove “prevent” in Building Block 3 page 7. – Replacing “promote” with “in keeping with all other cornerstones, Joyfield Township will encourage”...and replacing “prevent” with “discourages is under review. After reviewing the response, the commission members changed the block to read: “Discourage non-agricultural uses from negatively impacting agriculture as the primary land use.”
- 18.5. Remove “reasonable” from Building Block 5 page 7. – The planning commissioners are anticipating no changes. The response was confirmed.
- 18.6. Develop a definition /description for “Scenic Rural Character. – No changes are anticipated. The response was confirmed. However the planning commission may revisit this later.
- 18.7. Nice job defining opportunity to grow business and job – no response needed. The response was confirmed.
- 18.8. “Connect with regional trails Building Block 2 page 3 add bike lanes. Response: add “and bike lanes” to “Reserve adequate right of way for trails”. Building Block 2 page 3 will be revised to include ”and bike lanes” after “Reserve adequate right-of-way for trails”.
- 18.9. Expand natural gas and wifi – A collaborative effort of adjoining municipalities or governing units would benefit all. The response was confirmed.
- 18.10. Change “Rural” to “Rural Preservation” for zoning as in Blaine – No change is anticipated. The response was confirmed.
- 18.11. Cornerstone “Discourage Blight” Building Block 2 page 6: insert “consider” and change “work” to “working”. Response: change accordingly. Building Block 2 page 6 will be revised to: “.....consider working with Benzie County Brownfield...”
- 18.12. Blaine Twp. PC is offering to share “appropriate zoning ordinances” – As we develop Joyfield ordinances, this will be considered. The response was confirmed.
- 18.13. Include Joyfield Township in a Herring Lakes Watershed Management Plan. – This is a collaborative possibility. The response was confirmed.
- 18.14. Coordinate with Gilmore Township on Betsie River Watershed. – The river passes through additional units of governed areas between Joyfield Township and Gilmore Township. We would need input from Gilmore Township to proceed with this effort. The response was confirmed.

19. Township Planners comments were exchanged for additional revisions and considerations. These revision and changes generated from intergovernmental review comments will be on the agenda for the April 17th meeting. The following changes were made after reviewing the list.

- 19.1. Page 4, Building Block 3: "when feasible" will be deleted.
- 19.2. Page 5, first paragraph, last sentence: delete: "to be determined on a case by case basis as appropriate" and replace with "that could negatively affect our rural character".
- 19.3. Page 5, 2nd paragraph: delete "however".
- 19.4. Page 5 2nd paragraph last sentence: replace with: "The township encourages nodal development of light industry and commercial businesses. Cottage and value-added agricultural industries are supported throughout the township."
- 19.5. Page 5, Building Block 3: delete "other" and "possibly".
- 19.6. Page 5 Building Block 5: Change the wording to: "Discourage the development of industrial scale agriculture or non-agriculture that could negatively affect our rural character."
- 19.7. Page 8, Building Block 1: delete "greater".

A motion by wood to approve the changes as noted above with the exception of comment 8 regarding heliports and seconded by Krueger passed.

A motion by wood to identify heliport locations within tab2 and seconded by Krueger passed with an abstention by B Evans passed.

The planning commission members agreed to request scheduling of a public hearing on the master plan for the next scheduled meeting on May 15, 2014 at 7:00pm.

- 7. New Business: The planning commission discussed a request to change starting time of meetings beginning in May 2014 to 7:30pm. A motion by M. Evans to change the starting time for meetings to 7:30pm for May to October and seconded by Krueger passed.
- 8. Public input was heard. At a request by Deb Lindgren, the planning commission reviewed the contents of a letter previously submitted by Don Tanner. The planning commission determined that his concerns had been covered in previous discussions.
- 9. Adjournment: Motion to adjourn by Krueger, second by B. Evans. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 9:23pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ted Wood

