

MINUTES
BIG RAPIDS CHARTER TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION

Tuesday, May 8, 2018 --- 7:30 p.m.

Big Rapids Township Hall, 14212 Northland Drive, Big Rapids, MI 49307

I. CALL TO ORDER: 7:30 P.M.

Chairman Phil Keating called the regular meeting of the Big Rapids Charter Township Planning Commission to order at the township hall on Tuesday, May 8, 2018 at 7:30 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL:

Present: Mary Davis, Gordon Oliver, Mark Sweppenheiser, Amanda Wethington, Philip Keating and Carman Bean. Zach Cook is absent. The record shows a quorum is present. Also Present: Zoning Administrator and Recording Secretary, Brent Mason.

III. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST:

Mr. Keating asked if any of the Commission members had known conflicts of interest with any item on the agenda for this meeting. Mrs. Davis indicated that she has a conflict existed with item # 4, SUP18-002. The proposed site is adjacent to her property. Mr. Keating acknowledged this conflict and Mrs. Davis stated that she would leave the meeting when that item comes up.

Before discussion of the minutes began, Mr. Bean asked to add an item to the agenda under other business. He wished to speak to the recently approved communication tower's zoning and continued to advise that his statement will have no impact on what already has been done. Mr. Keating acknowledged the request.

IV. MINUTES:

Mr. Sweppenheiser moved to approve the minutes from March 13, 2018 and Mrs. Davis seconded the motion. Mr. Keating asked for comments, questions or corrections. None being heard, Mr. Keating called the question, and the minutes of March 13 were approved unanimously with 6 ayes.

Mr. Keating requested a motion for the minutes of April 10, 2018. Mr. Sweppenheiser made a motion to approve, seconded by Mrs. Davis. Mr. Keating asked for comments, questions or corrections. Mr. Keating brought up seven corrections, most of which were typographical errors, and all the changes will appear as strike out and corrections. There was brief discussion about the use of the word "classed" in Mrs. Wethington's comment on page 7, and that word will be left as stated. Mr. Keating asked that Mark Van Allsburg's name be referenced on page 9 as the attorney from Mika Meyers. Hearing no other comments or concerns, Mr. Keating called the question, and the minutes of April 10 were approved unanimously with 6 ayes.

V. PUBLIC COMMENT:

There was no public comment for items not on the agenda.

VI. PUBLIC HEARING AND SITE PLAN REVIEW FOR SUP18-002:

Mr. Keating started the discussion about SUP 18-002 at 7:40 p.m. Mrs. Davis recused herself and left the meeting room at this time. Mr. Keating asked Michelle Johnson to present her request to the Planning Commission. Ms. Johnson began by telling the Commission that she and her son would like to purchase some property on Northland Drive north of 12 Mile Road to build and operate a business. She then turned the floor over to her son, Jeremiah Johnson. Mr. Johnson began by telling the Commission that he wants to operate a drone racing hobby shop, for indoor drone racing. He indicated the size of the drones to be approximately 8 inches square. Mr. Keating asked if these drones fly overhead. Mr. Johnson answered that they do fly overhead, using what is called “first person view” or FPV. FPV uses a video camera on the drone, watching the flight through goggles while controlling the drone. The flight distance is limited by the radio frequency video feed limitations. Mr. Keating asked for some clarification, and Mr. Johnson stated that the image view the operator sees through the goggles/video screen is just like being in the drone itself. The course is an inside obstacle course with LED lit obstacles and will be open to the public with drones for rent. Mr. Johnson is in the process of getting his drone pilot’s license so he will be able to teach drone operation. Mr. Keating asked about the reference to the ground R/C truck and car track. Mr. Johnson explained that the drones fly in the air and the vehicles will use FPV on the ground (floor) with various obstacles also.

Mr. Bean asked if they would be doing any flying or operating cars outside. Mr. Johnson said that they would like to move outside at some point, but at first, they would just use the indoor area. Eventually they do plan to use the area outdoors but because the weather in Michigan isn’t always dry and sunny, it would mostly be inside as the drones cannot get wet.

Mr. Keating asked what range the drones could travel. Mr. Johnson said that some can travel pretty far but the drones they will use will operate on 25 mW and travel about 100 to 150 yards maximum. The quality of the video signal diminishes rapidly any further than that. He also stated that the controllers can be set so that the range can be limited if needed based on geographical information. That would limit how far the drones would be able to travel.

Mr. Bean noticed that the property is 165 feet wide and he asked for the depth, which was given as 662 feet from the right-of-way line. Mr. Mason showed the GIS aerial view of the property on the video screen and explained the location of the parcel to the Commission members as well as identified the adjacent parcels and other prominent landmarks.

Mr. Keating asked if there were any other questions for the Johnsons before they move on to public comment. Mr. Keating asked if the Johnsons had any other comments, and Mr. Johnson indicated that he did not have any further comment.

Mr. Keating asked James Davis for his comment, and Mr. Davis presented each member with a copy of a letter he drafted with his concerns about the proposed operation. Mr. Davis mentioned that some of the points have already been touched on by questions the Commission members asked. Mr. Davis advised that he and his wife own 20 acres adjacent to the west side of this property. Mr. Davis referenced the special use permit questions. The first item of concern is that this project will change the essential character

of the area, because this structure is different than any other structures that are around it. He feels it will make the landscape look different than anything else in the area. Regarding diminishing the property value, Mr. Davis contacted two local realtors and got their opinions that the property values would be most likely be reduced due to factors that follow commercial uses, such as traffic, noise and the look of the building. Mr. Davis is also concerned about the noise level that may be present if and when the drones are allowed to operate outside. He continued by saying that he feels these are important concerns and wants to make sure they are addressed by the Commission.

Mr. Keating asked what size the parcel to the south is. Mr. Mason advised it is approximately 12 acres. Mr. Sweppenheiser asked what the zoning of that parcel is, and Mr. Mason replied that all the parcels in this area are zoned agricultural.

Mr. Davis voiced one other concern regarding flying drones outdoors. He wondered what kind of effect it would have on the wildlife and hunting. Mr. Keating acknowledged that they are valid concerns.

Mr. Bean asked Mr. Keating if we knew whether there are any regulations on how close a drone can fly to the road. Mr. Johnson gave a brief overview of FAA regulations he was aware of regarding drones; you can't fly over governmental buildings, public buildings like hospitals, etc. but you can fly over roads. Mr. Bean stated that he remembers when he flew gliders that you were not allowed to fly over roads. There was some other discussion without definitive information. Mr. Keating asked Mr. Johnson what agency regulates drone flying. Mr. Johnson answered the FAA and the drone operators regulate themselves based on FAA rules. Mr. Keating asked if he had a copy of the FAA regulations, and Mr. Johnson said he did not have them with him, but he could get a copy. Mr. Johnson continued by saying that they would enforce the rules themselves, by requiring that the drones remain on their property. The radio control system they use for the FPV system is only 25 mW of power and it limits the number of users and the distance that the drones could fly because the signal diminishes rapidly. They would only be flying in the back of the property, so the road wouldn't be a factor, and there would only be six operators at a time because the signal quality would not be acceptable with more than six people operating at one time. Mr. Bean asked for clarification on the distance the back of the building is from the road right-of way, and he was advised that it was 270 feet. Mr. Bean asked if they flew outside, would they fly to the back of the building, to the west. Mr. Johnson stated that if they were allowed to fly outside, that they would fly to the west of the building. Ms. Johnson stated that they would not use all the area because some of it is quite wet and the drones can't get wet. Mr. Johnson mentioned that the range of the drones will be limited by the transmitter power and frequency (25 mW and 5.8 Ghz). Mr. Johnson stated that they don't need a large space because they use every aspect of the air such as gates 50 feet above the ground. Mr. Keating asked if they needed any permits or licenses to open a business like this. Ms. Johnson said they would be getting a sales tax license but didn't need any local permit to operate a business.

Robert Walworth asked if they intended to fly over their property only. Mr. Johnson answered that they would only fly over their property and only in the building to begin with. Training of drone pilots would only be done indoors. Mr. Walworth stated that he had prior flight experience and there are FAA rules that would regulate drone operation. If they stay over their property it would not be a problem, but if they operate over other people's

property, there could be some concerns. Mr. Johnson acknowledged that information and stated that they would operate within the FAA requirements. Mr. Johnson stated that he wished he would have brought the FAA regulations for Drone operations with him.

Mr. Keating believes that nobody will want to learn to fly drones inside a building and then not want to operate them outside. Mr. Johnson advised that the drones they would be using are relatively small, only 95 mm from motor to motor.

Mr. Keating asked Mr. Johnson if he flew drones outside. Mr. Johnson answered yes, he does.

Mr. Walworth asked Mr. Johnson if the range of the drones he flies outside is a half mile. Mr. Johnson answered that he doesn't even go that far. Mr. Johnson did acknowledge that there are drones with ranges of over a half mile, but the drones they will be using are low power, 25 mW.

Mr. Bean wanted clarification about the range of the drone being 450 feet maximum. Mr. Johnson stated the transmitter power is 25 mW. Mr. Bean said he doesn't know how that translates to flight range.

Mr. Davis referred to item 153.130 (C) 2, diminishing property value. If he were a prospective buyer and heard drones flying around, that would be a concern for him. Therefore, he believes that it could cause his property value to go down.

Mr. Johnson replied that the drones are relatively quiet, then he made a higher pitched buzzing sound, stating that they are louder than he could imitate, but from a distance, you can't really hear too much. Mr. Johnson did offer to show everyone his drone so they could see the actual size and also show them a video of a drone in operation.

Mr. Keating asked how Mr. Johnson was going to control the drones from leaving the property, making sure they stay on the 165-foot-wide parcel.

Mr. Johnson replied that they could put up a barrier, like a golf course net or they could use new technology such as geo-graphing, similar to GPS, which allows for the drone to be shut down if it leaves the designated operation area. Mr. Keating asked which one they were going to use. Ms. Johnson interjected that the track should guide the operators on where to go. Mr. Johnson continued that sometimes operators may push the limits and need to be controlled. Mr. Bean said some operators may not be that good at flying. Ms. Johnson said the operators that are learning stay inside. Mr. Johnson stated that the Geo-graphing control would be the best. Other than that, a ground station would be the easiest, and that controls the video feed transmission, which is how the drones could be dropped out of the sky. Mr. Keating asked if you need somebody to monitor the ground station. Mr. Johnson answered yes, someone always runs the ground station, and only six pilots can operate at one time. The drone pilots would need to schedule their time because only six operators could fly at any given time.

Mr. Keating asked for clarification about whether there could be six drones operating inside and six outside at the same time. Mr. Johnson advised that he can't currently see more

than six total between inside and outside operations due to the limitations of the technology.

Mr. Walworth asked if any drones would be flying without the video FPV. Mr. Johnson said they have no plans to offer that kind of service. He reiterated that they want to offer the FPV experience only, so that the operator feels like they are in the craft themselves.

Mrs. Walworth asked what would prohibit them from allowing others to bring their own R/C drones and having more than six drones in the air outside. Mr. Johnson replied that every drone on the market operates on the same frequency and that is currently the limiting factor. Because they all use the same frequencies, they can be jammed up and the drones would then fall to the ground if they aren't under control. Also, more than six operators create poor video signal issues, and the experience is not enjoyable.

Mr. Walworth wondered about the proximity to old 131 and is concerned about the risk to drivers should a drone fly into traffic. Mr. Bean said that the Planning Commission should know if there is a regulation regarding proximity to a roadway and what that regulation says.

Mr. Davis asked Mr. Keating what the outcome of this hearing would be, and whether there would be a decision today. Mr. Keating said a decision could be made tonight. Mr. Davis feels that there are still some unanswered questions regarding FAA regulations and that there should be more information provided before a decision is made.

Mr. Keating asked if there were any more questions or comments. Mr. Sweppenheiser asked how anyone else feels about this use being listed as a commercial use. He referenced the special permit section that suggests uses from the commercial district are allowable with a permit in the agricultural district. He went on to compare this use with uses that are listed and feels the request for outdoor use is not consistent with the other listed uses in the commercial district. Mr. Mason stated that he did feel the indoor use was consistent with some of the uses listed, such as sporting goods store. Mr. Keating mentioned that he did feel this use was similar to item (25) Golf course and similar recreational facilities. Mr. Bean stated that he is sure there is a requirement for a minimum distance from a roadway, but he can't quote it.

Mr. Keating asked if the Commission would like to pursue further consideration. Mr. Bean and Mr. Sweppenheiser mentioned that they would like more information about the FAA regulations regarding drone operations. They also continued that a golf course is not 165 feet wide and is not regulated by the FAA. Mr. Sweppenheiser continued by mentioning that there are constraints to this site and that he feels everyone probably has some concerns. Another factor is that this is not like any other request the Commission has heard.

Mr. Keating asked if there were any other comments from the public. Mabel Starr's daughter, Mrs. Mary Kay Walworth mentioned that her mother is concerned about increased noise, traffic, decrease in her property values, hours of operation, when will people be coming and going. Mr. Keating asked Mr. Johnson to address those concerns. Mr. Johnson answered that the hours would be limited at first because he will still be working his current job, so roughly from 2:00 p.m. to dark, 9:00 p.m. He doesn't wish to be

out any later than that because he has a family. Mrs. Walworth reiterated her points of concern. Mr. Mason read the letter that was emailed on behalf of Mrs. Starr.

May 4, 2018

To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing this letter in regards to SUP-18-002 for a special use permit in the Agricultural District.

I am opposed to this Special Use Permit for the Following reasons:

1. It will decrease the surrounding property value.
2. Having unexperienced individuals flying drones or planes over homeowner's property or Northland Drive is dangerous.

Thank you for your time and consideration of denying the Special Use Permit in the Agricultural District for the property address 12185 Northland Dr. Big Rapids, MI

Signed Mabel E. Starr
Property owner of 12325 Northland Drive
Big Rapids, MI 49307

Mr. Keating asked if there were any other comments. Hearing none, he closed the Public Hearing at 8:18 p.m.

Mr. Keating asked the members of the Planning Commission to turn to the Agricultural District information. Mr. Davis asked if the public could leave. Mr. Keating said they could, unless they wanted to stay. Mrs. Walworth wondered if there would be a decision approving or denying the request tonight. Mr. Bean answered that he did not know that. Mr. Keating advised that the Commission would look at the language in the Zoning Ordinance to see if it will allow for this use. He continued to state that as long as the ordinance allows for this type of use, they will continue to review the request in accordance with the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Mason advised Mrs. Walworth that the decision may or may not be made this evening. Mrs. Walworth asked if she could call tomorrow to see if a decision was reached and Mr. Mason stated that she certainly could.

Mr. Keating referred to the Agricultural district language, mentioning that this use is not a permitted use, but that it appears to be allowed by special use permit as a commercial use in the Ag District per Sec.153.019 (A) 41. Mr. Sweppenheiser stated that this section seems to most likely represent the requested use and Mr. Keating agreed. Mr. Sweppenheiser continued saying that since this request is fairly unique, the Commission will need to consider which uses are similar to the requested use. Mr. Keating mentioned that when the Zoning Ordinance was put together, these types of uses and activities did not exist. Mr. Bean said that the zoning ordinance is a dynamic document, and many members agreed. Mr. Keating asked if anybody thought that this use does not qualify for consideration. No one answered. Mr. Sweppenheiser expounded on the condition that the use be indoor only. If outdoor use is allowed, there could be a different outcome. Mr. Oliver asked if there was a possibility of having a net put up, like a golf course. Mr. Oliver asked how high the drone could fly. Mr. Johnson answered that they can fly pretty high and might possibly fly over a net. He continued by restating that the experience they are providing is a first-person view (FPV) so the drone will most likely be flying closer to the ground through the various obstacles provided to optimize the experience.

Mr. Mason asked Mr. Johnson if the possibility of being limited to just indoor use would affect their decision to pursue this application. Mr. Johnson said that it would not, because he feels that his potential customers would be satisfied with the experience they will get by flying indoors only, flying fast around a track through the obstacles. He mentioned that the large “greenhouse” tent structures could be used to provide an outdoor feel while still being inside. Ms. Johnson did say that she thinks the outdoor experience is desirable. Mr. Johnson mentioned that the Geo-graphing of the outdoor course would limit where the drone would fly through GPS.

Mr. Sweppenheiser asked if additional equipment would be needed for Geo-graphing. Mr. Johnson answered that they would need to get the equipment to provide Geo-graphing control services, but that technology is easily available. Mr. Sweppenheiser mentioned that the other technology that limits the range of the drones may rapidly change and create situations where the drone might be less easily controlled. He is concerned that if the drones were to fall onto a neighbor’s property, there could be trespass issues or other concerns that are at a whole different level, especially if someone doesn’t like the business. Mr. Bean mentioned that nothing falls straight down. At speed, a drone could easily cross that property line. Mr. Johnson replied that he would do the calculations that would keep the drones inside their property by not allowing the drones to operate closer to the property line than the distance required to fall from the air at speed. Mr. Sweppenheiser asked if the property was wooded, and Mr. Johnson replied that there are woods on the property and the trees could be used as part of the course.

Mr. Keating stated that the application is for indoor use only. Ms. Johnson said she didn’t realize that there might be a difference, but she does think that the indoor and outdoor uses are both desirable. Mr. Keating asked the Johnson’s to decide if they want what they asked for in their application, or if they want something else, and that they will need to reapply if they want the outdoor use. Ms. Johnson asked if they could come back at a later time to apply for the outdoor use, and she was told that they could, but there is a chance that they may or may not get approved for the outdoor use. Mr. Keating asked them to decide which way they want to go, and Mr. Johnson stated that he would like to proceed with the request for the building and the indoor track only at this time. Then he could prepare the necessary information for the outdoor request and come back at a later time for consideration of the outdoor use. Mr. Johnson did state that he came in tonight only for the indoor request and the discussion started down the outdoor path, so he started answering those questions. He is satisfied with just being considered for the indoor use only. He understands that he can apply for the outdoor use at a later date.

Mr. Keating mentioned that since this is very new to everyone, we don’t have any experience with this particular use and can’t compare it to anything else. Mr. Keating asked if the Planning Commission members felt that this use fell into the current commercial zoning criteria. Mr. Bean and Mr. Sweppenheiser agreed that they felt it is consistent with the listed commercial district uses. Mr. Bean mentioned that if the use will be completely indoors, then he doesn’t have any concerns with this use.

Mr. Keating started the discussion by going through the requirements. All uses by special permit shall comply with each of the following standards and requirements.

(A). The nature, location, and size of the special use shall not change the essential character of the surroundings area, nor disrupt the orderly and proper development of the district as a whole. The use shall not be in conflict with or discourage the adjacent or neighboring lands or buildings.

Mr. Sweppenheiser said that he doesn't think it changes the character of the surrounding area. Mr. Bean agreed.

Mr. Keating moved on to item (B) - The special use shall not diminish the value of the land, buildings or structures in the neighborhood.

Mrs. Wethington said she did not think it would affect the value of the properties in the area.

Item (C) - The special use shall not increase traffic hazards or cause congestion on the public highways or streets of the area. Adequate access to the parcel shall be furnished.

Mr. Bean said that he did not see a problem with traffic or congestion on Northland Drive.

Item (D) - The water supply and sewage disposal system shall be adequate for the proposed special use by conforming to State and County Health Department requirements, and the special use shall not over-burden any existing services or facilities.

Mr. Mason stated that the District Health Department has already given them tentative approval for a well and septic at that location

Item (E) - Uses by special permit shall not be significantly more objectionable to nearby properties by reason of traffic, noise, vibrations, dust, fumes, odor, smoke, glare, lights, or disposal of waste than the operation of any principal permitted use, nor shall the special use increase hazards from fire or other dangers to either the property or adjacent property.

Mr. Bean said that he does not see any problem with that. He continued by saying that operating inside only made a world of difference.

Item (F) - The Planning Commission may require that the premises be permanently screened from adjoining or contiguous properties by a wall, fence, plant screen and/or other approved enclosure when deemed necessary to buffer the surrounding uses from objectionable noise, light, etc., created by the special use.

Mr. Sweppenheiser stated that he doesn't believe that any buffering is required. Mr. Bean agreed.

Item (G) - The special use shall be consistent with the intent and purpose of this Ordinance and with the intent of the Land Use Plan for Big Rapids Township. The special use shall be compatible with the natural environment and shall not be inimical to the public health, safety and general welfare.

Mr. Keating acknowledged that no one expressed any concerns.

Mr. Keating asked if the members were ready to vote.

Mr. Oliver asked if there were proper parking spaces for the building. Mr. Mason answered that there were. He stated that 12 spaces were provided for, and that the public area of the building (just over 1,000 sq. ft.) would require only 6 parking spaces. There was a brief discussion about the number of people that would be on the site at any given time, and since only six (drones or cars) total can be operating at once, it was determined that 12 spaces was adequate, based on the modified formula for businesses that utilize large warehouse areas. Mr. Oliver asked if the parking surface was going to be gravel or blacktop. Mr. Johnson answered that it would be gravel. Mr. Sweppenheiser mentioned that the entrance may need to have some paving provided for cars entering and exiting the property. Mr. Mason also mentioned that the Johnson's would need a commercial driveway permit from the road commission or MDOT and they would have to follow those requirements. Mr. Sweppenheiser and Mr. Bean both acknowledged that they are comfortable with whatever the road commission requires.

Mr. Sweppenheiser made a motion to approve SUP18-002 (PZ18-0013) for Michelle and Jeremiah Johnson to build and operate an indoor FPV Drone and R/C car facility at 12185 Northland Drive. Mr. Oliver seconded the motion. Mr. Keating asked if there were any comments or questions. Mr. Keating asked for the vote. The motion passed unanimously with five ayes and no nays. Mr. Keating advised the Johnsons that the SUP request has passed. Mr. Sweppenheiser congratulated them. Mr. Johnson thanked the Commission for helping him understand what information will be needed when he comes back with a request for the outdoor use in the future.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS:

Mr. Keating requested Mrs. Davis to return to the meeting. Mr. Keating asked Mr. Mason to start the discussion about the Capital Improvement Plan. Mr. Mason brought up the slides for the 2019 – 2024 Capital Improvement Plan. He explained the new information that was presented from Brandon Maneke regarding the cemetery, Grounds and Parks. All of his requests were new this year because he changed the timing of many of the items. Mr. Mason explained how the ranking system is supposed to work. He mentioned that the other requests from the previous year were carried forward and that the ranking of each item will have to be looked at in order to verify the Planning Commission still agrees with those scores. Mr. Sweppenheiser asked if all the requests from 2018 were included in the 2018 Budget. Mr. Mason referred that question to Mr. Stanek, who was in the audience. Mr. Stanek said that all the items requested did make it into the budget but was not sure that they would all be completed in 2018. The process of ranking each request took some discussion and time to work through to the final ranking. The first item was the Fire Department request for a new fire engine in 2020, and funding for this request is uncertain because the Fire Department Budget may not have enough funds to make this purchase by 2020. Mr. Mason talked at length about the ability of the Commission to apply weighting variables to each criterion. These weight determinations are at the discretion of the Planning Commission members. Mr. Keating asked how the Commission comes up with the weights and Mr. Mason explained that the weight for each criterion is meant to help

give important criteria more influence on the final score. Mr. Bean asked if the Commission was just working on 2019 or if they needed to work on other items. Mr. Mason said that the really important items are the requests for 2019, because they will be in the next budget. The other items are not as critical at this time. Mr. Keating asked if the CIP needs to be presented to the Board in June, and Mr. Mason answered that it needed a Public Hearing in June before being presented to the Board in July. Mr. Sweppenheiser asked what the Commission needs to do tonight. Mr. Mason said he is looking to get scores for the requests, so that that data can be put into the CIP report for the Public Hearing next month, then it will be forwarded on to the Board of Trustees. Mr. Bean asked if there are any changes that need to be made to the existing data from the previous year. Mr. Mason didn't believe that any of the previously existing items needed to be reviewed in great detail. Discussion with the commissioners lead to the determination that Mr. Mason should put the modified rankings for each of the existing items in the worksheet. Once that was finished, he would send that info to the PC members before the next meeting, so they could review it before the public hearing. The members did review each of the new item requests and the data was entered into the worksheet as follows:

1. ATV with plow for Perry Street sidewalk. Discussion about the criteria was undertaken, and the final score was a 2.14

Mrs. Wethington had to leave the meeting to pick-up her baby at this time.

2. Fencing for the Baseball-field at Highbanks park. Discussion for the criteria took place and the score was determined to be a 3.36
3. Replace the stairway to the river at Highbanks park. Criteria discussion resulted in a score being determined at 1.83

Items 4 and 5 have been ranked in the past (zero turn mower and pick-up truck)

6. Fishing platform discussion resulted in a score of 4.31
8. Cemetery Road repairs for 2023 to be scored as 2.93
9. Cemetery drainage will need more research for future determination. Ranking will be a 5.
10. Road work continues to be a priority and will be ranked at a 1.

Mr. Mason gave a rundown of how the CIP will be distributed to the Commission before the Public Hearing and said he would send a copy of the worksheet with rankings and the proposed document to them so they could review the CIP before the Public Hearing.

Mr. Mason gave a verbal rundown of his written report including building permit information and zoning activity. Mr. Mason gave the Commission members information about Freedom of Information Act requests regarding the Verizon Cell Tower SUP. Mr. Keating asked if they would still care about the FOIA request since the SUP was approved. Mr. Mason replied that he may still want the information in order to be prepared for a possible appeal. Mr. Keating and Mr. Bean carried on a discussion about whether an appeal could take place and what could be appealed

according to the ZEA. Mr. Mason advised that an appeal would have to be done based on whether the proper procedures were followed. There was discussion revolving around a Mr. Sweppenheiser brought up a language concern about special permits section F (1) with the current zoning ordinance in which the zoning board is referenced when it should say planning commission and later in the same paragraph the term planning commission is used when it should say Zoning Board of Appeals. Everyone is concerned about those entity names being misidentified. Mr. Sweppenheiser stated that we will need a Zoning ordinance text amendment to correct this error. Mr. Sweppenheiser stated that he wants this language corrected because it does matter that the language be accurate for the approval process. Everyone agreed that we do need to correct this and Mr. Mason will work on getting the language corrected. We will need to hold a public hearing and then make a recommendation to the board to change the language. Mr. Mason continued on with information on the progress of the previously approved projects for Resurrection Life Church and Belle Tire. He also talked about the property at 22420 Woodward and the status of the violation that he is working on. This property has a long history of non-compliance and Mr. Mason will be going to the residence with deputies from the Sheriff's Office. Mr. Mason mentioned another junk ordinance issue with the property on 190th Avenue just south of Garfield. He is attempting to determine who the responsible party is since the property owner is deceased, and the next-of-kin may not have any responsibility. Mr. Mason mentioned that a request has been received to rezone two parcels from A-residential to Commercial for the purpose of constructing student housing. A public hearing on that request will be held at the next Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Bean requested that his additional item for tonight's meeting be moved to the June meeting. Mr. Keating acknowledged that request. Mr. Bean mentioned that he wants to consider a minimum parcel size for any future tower sites.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT:

Hearing no further business for the Planning Commission, Mr. Keating announced that the meeting was adjourned at 10:06 p.m.

Motion to approve the Planning Commission minutes of May 8, 2018 by: Mr. Bean,
Seconded by: Mr. Oliver. Roll call vote carried with 6 ayes.

Philip Keating, Chairman
BIG RAPIDS CHARTER TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION

Date Approved