

# Joyfield Township Planning Commission Minutes

March 20, 2014

1. Call to Order @7:02pm
2. Roll Call – all present except Hayne who was excused.
3. Approval of Agenda – motion by Wood, second by Krueger, motion carried.
4. Public Input for agenda items – heard
5. Minutes from February 20th were read. Krueger made a motion to approve the February minutes. M. Evans seconded, motion carried.
6. Unfinished business  
  
None
7. New business:
  1. The Planning Commission reviewed and discussed public comments to the Master Plan
    1. MDOT comments regarding M22 were reviewed without comments as the highway does not traverse the township.
    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
    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.
      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.

3. The BCPC recommended adding provisions for “mixed use categories” throughout the township. Land uses within the zoning districts are yet to be determined.
  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.
  5. The BCPC recommended inclusion of a “Food Innovation District”. A program exists within L2L to accommodate this need.
  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.
4. Sharon May submitted comments addressing potential concerns of adjoining municipalities and participants in “visioning Sessions”.
    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.
    2. The planning commissioners acknowledged that we should note for future consideration the participant demographics of visioning sessions and seeking expanded or targeted participation.
  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.
  6. Tom Hart expressed concerns for the makeup of the township planning commission and future actions of their efforts. –
  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.
  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.
  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.

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.
11. Tom Hart 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.
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.
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.
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
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.
16. Myron Burzynski appreciates the efforts of L2L and the township planning efforts.
17. Comments were received from the West Benzie Joint Planning Commission (WBJPC)
  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.
  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.

3. Concerns of inconsistencies between Joyfield Township and Benzonia Township should be identified and resolved through collaborative efforts of planning commissions.
18. The Blaine Township Planning Commission submitted a comprehensive review of the township master plan and recommendations. NOTE: items under review in the subsections have not been inserted into the master plan by motions.
  1. Incorporate a statement regarding importance of cornerstones. – An insert of “Each cornerstone is important to the community, without ranking, and all require consideration when developing policies and zoning.” into “Expectations’ is under review.
  2. Define “co=exist” – will be addressed within the zoning ordinance.
  3. Remove “inappropriately” from Building Block 5 page 8 – This is under review.
  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.
  5. Remove “reasonable” from Building Block 5 page 7. – The planning commissioners are anticipating no changes.
  6. Develop a definition /description for “Scenic Rural Character. – No changes are anticipated.
  7. Nice job defining opportunity to grow business and job – no response needed.
  8. “Connect with regional trails Building Block 2 page 3 add bike lanes – Adding “and bike lanes” to “Reserve adequate right of way for trails” is under review.
  9. Expand natural gas and wifi – A collaborative effort of adjoining municipalities or governing units would benefit all.
  10. Change “Rural” to “Rural Preservation” for zoning as in Blaine – No change is anticipated.
  11. Cornerstone “Discourage Blight” Building Block 2 page 6: insert “consider” and change “work” to “working” – This is under review.
  12. Blaine Twp. PC is offering to share “appropriate zoning ordinances” – As we develop Joyfield ordinances, this will be considered.
  13. Include Joyfield Township in a Herring Lakes Watershed Management Plan. – This is a collaborative possibility.

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.

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 17<sup>th</sup> meeting

8. Public input – heard

9. Adjournment @ 7:44. Motion to adjourn by Wood, second by Krueger. Motion carried.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ted Wood