**Woodhull Township Planning Commission**

**December 18, 2019 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 7:02pm.

**Roll Call –** Members present at roll call: Scovill, Slavik and Daenzer. Excused absent: Betts. Absent: Thronson.

**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 3 yes/0 no.

**Approval of Minutes –** Moved by Slavik and supported by Daenzer to approve the minutes as presented.  Motion passed 3 yes/0 no.

**Old Business –
       A. PSUP19-09 Haley Law Firm. PLC.** It was reviewed by the Planning Commission that theShiawassee County Zoning Board of Appeals tabled thespecial use permit.

**New Business –
        A.** #**PZBA19-030 Joshua Walker** (the applicant and property owner was president). Public comment period followed on the proposed site location of 10544 Laingsburg Road, Laingsburg, Michigan 48848. 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 Slavik, to approve the application for #PZBA19-030. This conclusion was based on the following questions that are provided. **Motion for approval on this application request passed 3 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?**

None

1. **What, if any, error in judgment, procedure, or administration was made in the original Ordinance which justifies the petitioned change in zoning?**None
2. **What are the precedents and the possible effects of precedents and the possible effects of precedent which might result from the approval or denial of the petition?**

No concern of precedent being set in this location of the township due to very low descending housing in this area. There were no neighbor concerns presented. The Commission also concluded that there would be additional undue hardship if location B was selected.

1. **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?**

None

1. **Does the petitioned zoning change adversely affect the environmental conditions or value of the surrounding property?**

The surrounding neighbors are far enough away from impeding vision of the proposed building. There are two separate tree lines (natural barriers) that are already at the application address.

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

Yes. Agricultural residential property – A2 rural residential.

1. **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?**

It was recommended by the Commission that water management from roof run-off be considered in the construction of the building to minimize the possible negative effects of water erosion at the site.

1. **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

1. **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

1. **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?**

None

**General Public Comment – A general comment period was opened. No comments were offered. The comment period was closed.**

**Adjournment –** Motion to adjourn was made by Daenzer and supported by Slavik.  Motion passed 3 yes/0 no. Meeting adjourned at 7:27 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Stacey Brewer
Recording Secretary