

Woodhull Township Planning Commission

September 22, 2020 Board Meeting 7:00pm

Woodhull Township 7315 Beard Rd. Shaftsburg, MI 48872

DRAFT Minutes

Call to order – The meeting was called to order by Chairman Scovill at 7:00pm.

Roll Call – Members present at roll call: Scovill, Thronson, Betts Slavik Webb, and Daenzer.

Delegation of Visitors – Welcomed all visitors/voluntary sign-in sheet.

Approval of Agenda – Moved by Daenzer and supported by Slavik to approve the agenda as presented. Motion passed 6 yes/0 no.

Approval of Minutes – Moved by Slavik and supported by Daenzer to approve the minutes as presented. Motion passed 6 yes/0 no.

Public Comment Period: Public comment period was opened. Representative Carol & Ross Aldrich spoke on behalf of PZBA20-012. The comment period was closed.

Old Business – None

New Business –

A. #PZBA20-012 Carol & Ross Aldrich (the applicant was president). Public comment period was opened on the proposed site location of 11890 Shaftsburg Road, Laingsburg, Michigan 48848. The applicant and multiple residents spoke in favor of the application. There were also two electronic emails received in favor of the application that were shared by Chairman Scovill. The public comment period was then closed by Chairman Scovill. Planning commission members then reviewed the standards for the application approval based on the information available to the commission. Moved by Daenzer, supported by Thronson, to approve the application for #PZBA20-012. This conclusion was based on the following questions that are provided. **Motion for approval on this application request passed 6 yes/0 no. The finding of fact responses to the standards, as agreed upon by the Woodhull Township Planning Commission, are as follows:**

- 1. What, if any, identifiable conditions related to the petition have changed which justifies the petitioned change in zoning?**
5 acres was already set aside from the original 75 acres that was never included in the split.
- 2. What, if any, error in judgment, procedure, or administration was made in the original Ordinance which justifies the petitioned change in zoning?**
If the State of Michigan would have honored Shiawassee County zoning rules in the initial application, then the State of Michigan should have never allowed for the 5 acres to be left for development. The State of Michigan allowed for the potential split and allowed for the 5 acres to be set -out of the preservation plan.
- 3. What are the precedents and the possible effects of which might result from the approval or denial of the petition?**
The easement was set for that particular size by the State of Michigan.
- 4. What is the impact of the amendment on the ability of the County and other governmental agencies to provide adequate public services and facilities and/or programs that might reasonably be required in the future if the petition is approved?**
No changes
- 5. Does the petitioned zoning change adversely affect the environmental conditions or value of the surrounding property?**
No

6. Does the petitioned zoning change generally comply with the adopted Future Land Use Plan of Shiawassee County?

Yes. Agricultural residential property – A2 rural residential.

7. Are there any significant negative environmental impacts which would reasonably occur to surface water drainage of the petitioned zoning change and resulting allowed structures were built?

None

8. Are there any significant negative environmental impacts which would reasonably occur to waste water disposal if the petitioned zoning change and resulting allowed structures were built?

None

9. Are there any significant negative environmental impacts which would reasonably occur to surface or subsurface water quality if the petitioned zoning change and resulting allowed structures were built?

None

10. Are there any significant negative environmental impact which would reasonably result in the loss of valuable natural resources such as forests, wetlands, historic sites, wildlife, mineral deposits, or valuable agricultural land if the petitioned zoning change and resulting allowed structures were built?

No change

General Public Comment: General comment period was opened by Chairman Scovill. John (current neighbor) spoke in favor of PZBA20-012.

Adjournment – Motion to adjourn was made by Slavik and supported by Thronson. Motion passed 6 yes/0 no.

Meeting adjourned at 7:28pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Stacey Brewer
Recording Secretary