

**TYRONE TOWNSHIP
REGULAR BOARD MEETING AGENDA
JUNE 15, 2021 - 7:00 P.M.
(810) 629-8631**

This meeting will be held in person only at the township hall.

CALL TO ORDER – PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE – 7:00 P.M.

ROLL CALL

APPROVAL OF AGENDA – OR CHANGES

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

- Regular Board Meeting Minutes – May 18, 2021
- Board & Planning Commission Joint Meeting Minutes – June 1, 2021
- Treasurer’s Report- May 31, 2021
- Clerk’s Warrants and Bills

COMMUNICATIONS

1. Planning Commission Meeting Synopsis- June 8, 2021
2. Planning Commission Approved Meeting Minutes – January 12, 2021
3. Planning Commission Approved Meeting Minutes – February 9, 2021
4. Planning Commission Approved Meeting Minutes – March 9, 2021
5. Emergency Services Report- May 2021

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Discussion of historic town hall.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Approval to rent out township hall post COVID.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

PUBLIC REMARKS

This is a time for residents to voice their comments, opinions or concerns on township-related issues and each person is allowed up to three minutes to speak. Please understand this is not a Q&A session and the Board may not answer questions.

ADJOURNMENT

* * * * *

Supervisor Mike Cunningham Clerk Marcella Husted

Please note: Anyone wishing to address the Township Board may do so during Public Remarks. The Tyrone Township Board of Trustees has established a policy limiting the time a person may address the Township Board at a regular or at a special meeting during the Public Remarks section of the agenda to three minutes. The Board reserves the right to place an issue under the New Business section of the agenda if additional discussion is warranted or to respond later either verbally or in writing through an appropriately appointed Township Official. Individuals with disabilities requiring auxiliary aids or services should contact the Tyrone Township Clerk at (810) 629-8631 at least seven days prior to the meeting.

CONSENT AGENDA

Regular Board Meeting Minutes – May 18, 2021

Board & Planning Comm. Joint Meeting Minutes – June 1, 2021

Treasurer's Report- May 31, 2021

Clerk's Warrants and Bills

**TYRONE TOWNSHIP
REGULAR BOARD MEETING
APPROVED MINUTES – MAY 18, 2021**

CALL TO ORDER

Supervisor Cunningham called the meeting of the Tyrone Township Board to order with the Pledge of Allegiance on May 18, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. electronically via Zoom per Covid-19 restrictions.

ROLL CALL

Present: Supervisor Mike Cunningham, Treasurer Jennifer Eden, Clerk Marcella Husted, Trustees Kurt Schulze, Herman Ferguson, David Walker, and Zach Tucker.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA – OR CHANGES

Trustee Walker moved to approve the agenda as amended. (Treasurer Eden seconded.) The motion carried; all ayes. The following items were added to the agenda:

Unfinished Business #2 Joint meeting dates with Planning Commission.
New Business #3 Lake Shannon firework display permit application.

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

Regular Board Meeting Minutes – March 30, 2021
Treasurer’s Report- March 31, 2021
Treasurer’s Report- April 30, 2021
Clerk’s Warrants and Bills

Trustee Schulze moved to approve the consent agenda as presented. (Trustee Tucker seconded.) The motion carried; all ayes.

COMMUNICATIONS

1. **Livingston County Sheriff’s Report – March 31, 2021**
2. **Livingston County Sheriff Report – April 30, 2021**
3. **Fire Service Report**
4. **Planning Commission Meeting Synopsis- May 11, 2021**

Trustee Walker moved to receive and place on file Communications #1-4 as presented. (Treasurer Eden seconded.) The motion carried; all ayes.

PUBLIC REMARKS

Remarks included interest in the historic town hall, rezoning, and general opinions.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. **Historic township hall discussion.**

The Board discussed moving the historic town hall from the Center Road location to the current township address on Runyan Lake Road. The Board decided the first step should be assessing the cost and feasibility of moving the structure. No motion was made.

**TYRONE TOWNSHIP
REGULAR BOARD MEETING
APPROVED MINUTES – MAY 18, 2021 – PAGE 2**

UNFINISHED BUSINESS *(continued)*

2. Joint meeting with Planning Commission.

Supervisor Cunningham gave the board members two dates when they'd be available to have a joint meeting with the Planning Commission. No motion was made.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Request of Benjamin Dexter to defer sewer connection.

Mr. Dexter's property currently has a septic field, but is within the sewer district. He applied for a land division and was granted conditional approval, with the requirement to hook to the sewer within one year. He asked the board permission to postpone the sewer connection to the time the septic field fails. Supervisor Cunningham said legal counsel said the sewer ordinance has no mechanism for it to be done. No motion was made.

2. Runyan Lake Association request for a firework display permit.

Trustee Tucker moved to approve Runyan Lake Association's request for a firework display permit, with two conditions: operator name and signature correction. (Trustee Walker seconded.) The motion carried; all ayes.

[It was found the operators' names would not be available until closer to the event and the applicant's signature on the application was indeed correct.]

3. Lake Shannon Association request for a firework display permit.

Trustee Tucker moved to approve Lake Shannon Association's request for a firework display permit, with two conditions: operator name and signature correction. (Trustee Walker seconded.)

[It was found the operators' names would not be available until closer to the event and the applicant's signature on the application was indeed correct.]

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

None.

PUBLIC REMARKS

Residents voiced opinions.

ADJOURNMENT

Trustee Walker moved to adjourn. (Treasurer Eden seconded.) The motion carried; all ayes. The meeting adjourned at 8:12 p.m.

**TYRONE TOWNSHIP
BOARD & PLANNING COMMISSION JOINT MEETING
APPROVED MINUTES – JUNE 1, 2021**

CALL TO ORDER

Supervisor Cunningham called the meeting of the Tyrone Township Board and Planning Commission to order with the Pledge of Allegiance on June 1, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. at the Tyrone Township Hall.

ROLL CALL

Present: Supervisor Mike Cunningham, Treasurer Jennifer Eden, Clerk Marcella Husted, Trustees Kurt Schulze, Herman Ferguson, David Walker, and Zach Tucker; Planning Commissioners Dan Stickel, Jon Ward, Richard Erickson, Perry Green, Steve Krause, and Bill Wood.

Also present: Zoning Administrator Ross Nicholson, Carlisle Wortman planners Zach Michels and Doug Lewan, township attorney Chuck Widmaier, and township engineer Phil Westmoreland.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA – OR CHANGES

Trustee Walker moved to approve the agenda as amended. (Treasurer Eden seconded.) The motion carried; all ayes. The amendment was as follows:

Moved the Master Plan topic to the end of the agenda to allow planner Doug Lewan to join electronically later.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Sight Lines.

The group discussed the problems with the sight line requirements: lack of a defined process, the difficulty in applying a uniform, fair/equitable standard, particularly on lakefront properties, and enforceability. Planner Zach Michels (Carlisle Wortman) explained ways other municipalities tackled sight line issues. The Planning Commission will come up with ideas and present them to the board at a later time. No motion was made.

2. Accessory Structure Amendments.

Zoning Administrator Ross Nicholson said he receives many complaints on the requirements of accessory structures size; residents want larger structures to safehouse equipment and “toys,” although aesthetics remains the challenge. He also receives requests to have a structure or trailer prior to building the primary home for a time longer, to allow the owner to live in while building. Other requests—accessory structures in front yards and accessory dwelling units (aka mother-in-law units)—were also discussed. No motion was made.

The group agreed the Planning Commission should look at the feasibility of:

- Modifying the current review process to permit accessory structures up to 1,200 sq. feet in certain zoning districts.

**TYRONE TOWNSHIP
BOARD & PLANNING COMMISSION JOINT MEETING
APPROVED MINUTES – JUNE 1, 2021 – PAGE 2**

- Permitting larger accessory structures on parcels over 2 acres/being less restrictive in more rural zoning areas.
- Allowing other areas of the yard, other than backyard, for accessory structures, or to make less restrictive in certain zoning districts.
- Limiting accessory dwelling units to larger lot sizes or zoning districts, at least at first; addressing rental issues, but stopping short of allowing short-term rentals (such as Airbnbs).

3. Signs.

Sign regulations need to be updated to include a SCOTUS decision disallowing the discrimination of specific signs. No motion was made.

4. Planning & Zoning Department future needs.

Supervisor Cunningham spoke of needing an extra position in the Planning & Zoning department in the near future. No motion was made.

[Public comments were taken at this point, until Doug Lewan was able to join electronically.]

5. Master Plan.

Doug Lewan of Carlisle Wortman Associates explained the process of creating a successful Master Plan. Mr. Lewan said the Master Plan process could take up to a year or more. No motion was made.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

None.

PUBLIC REMARKS

Comments included interest in the historic town hall, the Master Plan, and general opinions.

ADJOURNMENT

Trustee Walker moved to adjourn. (Treasurer Eden seconded.) The motion carried; all ayes. The meeting adjourned at 9:39 p.m.

6/8/2021

TYRONE TOWNSHIP TREASURER'S REPORT

JMM

Period ending MAY, 2021

TOWNSHIP FUNDS	Interest Ckg	INVESTMENTS ICS	Int Rate	MICHIGAN CLASS	Int Rate Monthly AVG	FLG PEG CD matures 8/9/21	Int rate	Grand Totals Each Fund
General 101	\$1,298,970.29	\$ 2,433,491.04	2.22%					\$ 3,732,461.33
Tech Fund 141	\$51,781.85	\$ 5,000.00	2.22%					\$56,781.85
Building & Site 145	\$172,657.37	\$ 7,500.00	2.22%					\$180,157.37
Parks/Recreation 208	\$5,934.23		0.40%					\$5,934.23
Liquor Control 212	\$2,225.85		0.40%					\$2,225.85
Road 245	\$273,368.18	\$ 44,224.80	2.22%	\$261,933.78	1.00%			\$ 579,526.76
Revolving 246	\$164,513.95	\$ 97,500.00	0.40%	\$192,418.56	1.00%			\$ 454,432.51
Right of Way 260	\$21,033.66		0.40%					\$21,033.66
Peg 274	\$180,033.91					\$ 194,254.01	0.20%	\$374,287.92
Lk Tyrone Grant 281	\$0.00		0.40%					\$0.00
Special Assessments								
Jayne Hill Lts 218	\$1,965.33		0.40%					\$1,965.33
Walnut Shores Lts 219	\$777.91		0.40%					\$777.91
Shannon Glen Rubbish 225	\$5,723.97							\$5,723.97
Jayne Hill Rubbish Removal 226	\$21,305.08		0.40%					\$21,305.08
Apple Orchard Rubbish Removal 227	\$5,487.34							\$5,487.34
Silver Lake Rubbish Removal 228	\$13,716.83							\$13,716.83
Parkin Lane Snow 231	\$16,355.64		0.40%					\$16,355.64
Great Oaks Dr 232	\$10,295.97		0.40%					\$10,295.97
Laurel Springs Rubbish removal 233	\$6,755.00							\$6,755.00
Account Totals	\$2,252,902.36	\$ 2,587,715.84		\$454,352.34		\$ 194,254.01		\$ 5,489,224.55
Health Flex Spending 101		The State Bank						Health Flex Total
FSA Account (\$10K Loan to Open)		\$ 9,074.19	0.00%					\$ 9,074.19
								\$ 9,074.19
Public Safety- 205								Public Safety Total
Public Safety 205 - State Bank checking		\$ 568,668.31	0.40%					\$ 568,668.31
Public Safety 205- State Bank Savings		\$ 6,402.81						\$ 6,402.81
Public Safety 205 - Level One Bank		\$ 205,273.95	0.40%					\$ 205,273.95
Public Safety ICS- 205 State Bank		\$ 773,807.15	2.22%					\$ 773,807.15
								\$ 1,554,152.22
TYRONE TOWNSHIP SEWER 2003- 392		Flagstar						Tyrone Sewer 03 Total
Debt Service 392 Flagstar Bank		\$ 180,311.55	0.6%					\$ 180,311.55
Flagstar CDARS 2003 (matures 4/21/2022)(0817)		\$ 547,547.96	0.15%					\$ 547,547.96
Flagstar CD 2003 (matures 3/29/2021)(3879)		\$ 1,000,000.00	0.25%					\$ 1,000,000.00
Flagstar CDARS 2003 Fund Martures 9/16/21)(6978		\$ 468,246.15	0.20%					\$ 468,246.15
								\$ 2,196,105.66
Road Improvements-		Flagstar						Road Improvement Total
Parkin Lane Rd 2010 (396)		\$ 49,837.77	0.70%					\$ 49,837.77
Lake Shannon 2018 (399)		\$ 407,253.74	0.70%					\$ 407,253.74
Laurel springs (400)		\$ 56,638.15	0.70%					\$ 56,638.15
Irish Hills (401)		\$ 214,556.69						\$ 214,556.69
CIBC- Parkin Lane CD(matures 8/9/2021)		\$ 127,731.00	0.20%					\$ 127,731.00
								\$ 856,017.35
SEWER O&M CHECKING ACCT- 590		Flagstar						Sewer O&M Total
Sewer Operation and Maintenance CK (5710)		\$ 331,314.98	0.70%					\$ 331,314.98
Sewer Operation and Maintenance SV (4865)		\$ 82,748.42	1.39%					\$ 82,748.42
CIBC- O&M CD(matures 8/6/21)(6337)		\$ 162,426.04	0.40%					\$ 162,426.04
O&M CDARS (matures 8/12/2021)(4312)		\$ 142,760.73	1.64%					\$ 142,760.73
O&M CDARS (matures 8/10/2021)(4710)		\$ 146,188.13	0.20%					\$ 146,188.13
								\$ 865,438.30
TRUST & AGENCY- 701		Chase						Trust & Agency Total
Township Trust and Agency 701 Savings		\$ 1,513.78	0.18%					\$ 1,513.78
Township Trust and Agency 701 Checking		\$ 39,077.24	0.00%					\$ 39,077.24
								\$ 40,591.02
								\$ 5,521,378.74
Total Township Monies								\$ 11,010,603.29

Check Date	Bank	Check	Vendor Name	Description	Amount
Bank 001 STATE BANK COMMON ACCOUNT					
05/18/2021	001	22735	BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF MICHIGAN	HEALTH INSURANCE JUNE 2021	7,867.35
05/18/2021	001	22736	CARLISLE/WORTMAN ASSOCIATES, INC	TOWNSHIP PLANNER URBAN CROSSING PLANNER REZONE PLANNER REZONE PLANNER ASPHALT PLANT PLANNER	650.00 750.00 50.00 50.00 170.00
					<u>1,670.00</u>
05/18/2021	001	22737	CHARTER COMMUNICATIONS	TOWNSHIP INTERNET 5.11.21 -6.10.21	124.98
05/18/2021	001	22738	HARRIS & LITERSKI ATTORNEYS AT	LEGAL FEES APRIL 2021	3,826.17
05/18/2021	001	22739	LIVINGSTON COUNTY REGISTER OF DEEDS	EXTENSION OF EASEMENT BETWEEN TOWNSHIP &	30.00
05/18/2021	001	22740	FITNEY BOWES GLOBAL	POSTAGE METER LEASE 6.10.21 - 9.9.21	190.23
05/18/2021	001	22741	PRINTING SYSTEMS, INC.	AV BALLOT RETURN ENVELOPES AV BALLOT OUTER ENVELOPES ELECTION FORMS	194.53 192.70 170.78
					<u>558.01</u>
05/18/2021	001	22742	VOYA INSTITUTIONAL TRUST COMPANY	EMPLOYEE CONTR 5.19.21	1,305.00
05/26/2021	001	22743	GRIFFIN PEST SOLUTIONS, INC	PEST CONTROL	51.00
05/26/2021	001	22744	INTERSTATE SIGN PRODUCTS INC.	REFLECTIVE SIGNS	11.00
05/26/2021	001	22745	LAKE FENTON COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	PEG REIMB	2,908.55
05/26/2021	001	22746	LCMCA	MEMBERSHIP DUES 2021/2022	20.00
05/26/2021	001	22747	MICHIGAN TOWNSHIPS ASSOCIATION	TOWNSHIP ASSOCIATION DUES 7.1.21 - 6.30.	6,229.65
05/26/2021	001	22748	PRINTING SYSTEMS, INC.	AV BALLOT OUTER ENVELOPES	192.74
05/26/2021	001	22749	RESERVE ACCOUNT	POSTAGE METER REFILL	2,500.00
06/03/2021	001	22750	APEX SOFTWARE	MAINTENANCE RENEWAL (5.1.21 - 5.1.22) SKETCH 7 PRO	235.00 745.00
					<u>980.00</u>
06/03/2021	001	22751	CHASE CARD SERVICE	CREDIT CARD PURCHASES	854.94
06/03/2021	001	22752	CONSUMERS ENERGY	TOWNSHIP HALL ELECTRIC 4.23.21 - 5.23.21	438.16
06/03/2021	001	22753	LIVINGSTON COUNTY ASSESSOR'S ASSOC.	2021/2022 MEMBERSHIP (ALEXA HUSPEK & BRU	20.00
06/03/2021	001	22754	LIVINGSTON COUNTY TREASURER	DOG LICENSE MAY 2021 #3501-3506	267.50
06/03/2021	001	22755	REPUBLIC SERVICES#237	TRASH SERVICE - SHANNON GLEN - JUNE 2021 TRASH SERVICE - SILVER LAKE - JUNE 2021	440.72 1,219.75
					<u>1,660.47</u>
06/03/2021	001	22756	SHRED-IT USA	SHREDDING 5.10.21	66.61
06/03/2021	001	22757	VOYA INSTITUTIONAL TRUST COMPANY	EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTIONS	160.00
06/08/2021	001	22758	AT&T MOBILITY	CELL SERVICE - JUNE 2021	79.46
06/08/2021	001	22759	CONSUMERS ENERGY	LED STREET LIGHTS - MAY 2021 STREET LIGHTS - MAY 2021	119.15 105.98
					<u>225.13</u>
06/08/2021	001	22760	DOUGIE'S DISPOSAL & RECYCLING	TRASH REMOVAL - QUARTERLY TRASH REMOVAL - QUARTERLY	1,400.00 1,599.00
					<u>2,999.00</u>
06/08/2021	001	22761	HARRIS & LITERSKI ATTORNEYS AT	LEGAL SERVICES	1,917.50
06/08/2021	001	22762	IVS COMM, INC.	TELEPHONE SERVICE - MAY 2021	125.00

Check Date	Bank	Check	Vendor Name	Description	Amount
06/08/2021	001	22763	LIVINGSTON COUNTY INFORMATION TECHN	BASE MAP/ GIS SERVICE	172.00
06/08/2021	001	22764	LIVINGSTON COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT	LIQUOR LICENCE ENFOR 2021	2,225.85
06/08/2021	001	22765	MACKLIN MECHANICAL COMPANY	FINAL PAYMENT HVAC	15,807.00
				FINAL PAYMENT HVAC	8,940.00
				FINAL PAYMENT HVAC	2,565.00
				FINAL PAYMENT HVAC	3,820.00
					<u>31,132.00</u>
06/08/2021	001	22766	PLANNING & ZONING CENTER, INC.	9 COPIES PLANNING & ZONING NEWS	204.00
06/08/2021	001	22767	RICOH USA, INC.	COPIER LEASE 5.28.21 - 6.27.21	124.21
06/08/2021	001	22768	RICOH USA, INC.	EXCESS COPIES (5,274 B&W 2,073 COLOR)	150.41
06/08/2021	001	22769	STAPLES ADVANTAGE	OFFICE SUPPLIES	518.27
06/08/2021	001	22770	SUNSET MAINTENANCE, LLC	4 CLEANINGS - MAY 2021	560.00
06/08/2021	001	22771	VIEW NEWSPAPER GROUP	PUBLIC NOTICES	554.41
					<u>554.41</u>

001 TOTALS:

Total of 37 Checks:	72,919.60
Less 0 Void Checks:	0.00
Total of 37 Disbursements:	<u>72,919.60</u>

Bank 022 STATE BANK - PUBLIC SAFETY checking

05/18/2021	022	1243	HARTLAND AREA FIRE DEPARTMENT	10 FIRE RUNS 4.1.21 - 4.15.21	11,576.00
				8 FIRE RUNS 4.16.21 - 4.30-21	10,129.00
					<u>21,705.00</u>
05/18/2021	022	1244	ROSATI, SCHULTZ, JOPPICH&AMTSBUECHLER	LAWYER FEES - PUBLIC SAFETY	210.00
06/03/2021	022	1245	HARTLAND AREA FIRE DEPARTMENT	3 FIRE RUNS 5.1.21 - 5.15.21	4,341.00
					<u>4,341.00</u>

022 TOTALS:

Total of 3 Checks:	26,256.00
Less 0 Void Checks:	0.00
Total of 3 Disbursements:	<u>26,256.00</u>

Bank 102 SEWER O&M CHECKING 590

05/18/2021	102	437	TYRONE TOWNSHIP	REPAYMENT OF NSF FEE PAID BY TRANSNATION	45.00
06/08/2021	102	438	LIVINGSTON COUNTY DRAIN COMM.	SEWER O&M 4.29.21 - 5.27.21	64,907.10
					<u>64,907.10</u>

102 TOTALS:

Total of 2 Checks:	64,952.10
Less 0 Void Checks:	0.00
Total of 2 Disbursements:	<u>64,952.10</u>

Bank 108 TAX FUND FLAGSTAR

05/18/2021	108	2995	TYRONE TOWNSHIP	COUNTY SETTLEMENT CHECK DISB (PUBLIC SAE	33,771.05
05/18/2021	108	2996	TYRONE TOWNSHIP	COUNTY SETTLEMENT CHECK DISB (2003 SW)	31,390.00
05/18/2021	108	2997	TYRONE TOWNSHIP	COUNTY SETTLEMENT CHECK DISB (ROADS)	9,129.86
05/18/2021	108	2998	TYRONE TOWNSHIP	COUNTY SETTLEMENT CHECK DISB (O&M)	11,762.54
05/18/2021	108	2999	TYRONE TOWNSHIP	COUNTY SETTLEMENT CHECK DISB (COMMON)	28,837.27
					<u>28,837.27</u>

06/10/2021 10:53 AM
User: MHUSTED
DB: Tyrone

CHECK REGISTER FOR TYRONE TOWNSHIP
CHECK DATE FROM 05/11/2021 - 06/09/2021

Page: 3/3

Check Date	Bank	Check	Vendor Name	Description	Amount
------------	------	-------	-------------	-------------	--------

108 TOTALS:

Total of 5 Checks:					114,890.72
Less 0 Void Checks:					0.00
Total of 5 Disbursements:					<u>114,890.72</u>

Bank 203 TRUST & AGENCY 701 CKG

05/18/2021	203	1893	LIVINGSTON COUNTY TREASURER	SPECIFIC MOBILE HOME SET TAX - APRIL 202	2,142.50
05/18/2021	203	1894	TYRONE TOWNSHIP	SPECIFIC MOBILE HOME SET TAX - APRIL 202	428.57
06/08/2021	203	1895	CROMAINE LIBRARY	DPPT DISB 5.1.21 - 5.31.21	10.61
06/08/2021	203	1896	FENTON SCHOOLS	DPPT DISB 5.1.21 - 5.31.21	6.58
06/08/2021	203	1897	GISD	DPPT DISB 5.1.21 - 5.31.21	1,171.54
06/08/2021	203	1898	HARTLAND CONSOLIDATED SCHOOLS	DPPT DISB 5.1.21 - 5.31.21	72.02
06/08/2021	203	1899	LESA	DPPT DISB 5.1.21 - 5.31.21	14.26
06/08/2021	203	1900	LINDEN COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	DPPT DISB 5.1.21 - 5.31.21	6,994.29
06/08/2021	203	1901	LIVINGSTON COUNTY TREASURER	DPPT DISB 5.1.21 - 5.31.21	3,204.71
06/08/2021	203	1902	MOTT COMMUNITY COLLEGE	DPPT DISB 5.1.21 - 5.31.21	839.08
06/08/2021	203	1903	TYRONE TOWNSHIP	DPPT DISB 5.1.21 - 5.31.21	862.77

203 TOTALS:

Total of 11 Checks:					15,746.93
Less 0 Void Checks:					0.00
Total of 11 Disbursements:					<u>15,746.93</u>

REPORT TOTALS:

Total of 58 Checks:					294,765.35
Less 0 Void Checks:					0.00
Total of 58 Disbursements:					<u>294,765.35</u>

COMMUNICATION #1

Planning Commission Meeting Synopsis-
June 8, 2021

**TYRONE TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING SYNOPSIS
June 8, 2021 7:00 p.m.**

Note: This meeting was held at the Tyrone Township Hall

PRESENT: Kurt Schulze, Perry Green, Dan Stickel, and Jon Ward

ABSENT: Rich Erickson, Steve Krause, and Bill Wood

OTHERS PRESENT: Ross Nicholson & Zach Michels (CWA)

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 7:00 by Chairman Stickel.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA: Approved as presented.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

- 1) **02/09/2021 Regular Meeting & Public Hearing Minutes:** Approved as presented.
- 2) **03/09/2021 Regular Meeting Minutes:** Approved as presented.

OLD BUSINESS:

- 1) **Lake Urban Crossing Preliminary PUD Plan:** The Planning Commission reviewed the application and discussed with the applicants and Planner. Direction on suggested revisions to the application was provided to the applicants. Several public comments were received. No action was taken.

NEW BUSINESS:

- 1) **Salomonson Recreational Facility Special Land Use:** The Planning Commission reviewed the application and discussed with the applicants and Planner. Direction on suggested revisions to the application was provided to the applicants. Several public comments were received. No action was taken.

CALL TO THE PUBLIC: The Chairman allowed three minutes each to anyone in the public wishing to make a comment. Several comments and questions were heard.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:

- 1) **Next Workshop Meeting:** Scheduled for Wednesday, June 16, 2021, beginning at 6:00 pm.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 by Chairman Stickel.

COMMUNICATION #2

Planning Commission Approved Meeting
Minutes – January 12, 2021

1 **TYRONE TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION**
2 **REGULAR MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES**

3 **January 12, 2021 7:00 p.m.**

4 **Meeting Held Via Zoom Teleconference**

5 **The Meeting was Recessed at 7:30 pm for a Public Hearing**
6
7

8 **PRESENT:** Dan Stickel, Kurt Schulze, Rich Erickson, Bill Wood, Perry Green, and Jon Ward
9

10 **ABSENT:** Steve Krause
11

12 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Ross Nicholson
13

14 **CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chairman Stickel at 7:01 pm.
15

16 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:**
17

18 **CALL TO THE PUBLIC:**
19

20 Chairman Stickel asked if there were any members of the public in attendance who would like to
21 ask any questions or make public comment. No public questions or comments were received.
22

23 **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:**
24

25 Kurt Schulze made a motion to approve the agenda as presented. Rich Erickson supported the
26 motion. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.
27

28 **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:**
29

30 11/10/2020 Regular Meeting & Public Hearing Minutes
31

32 Kurt Schulze made a motion to approve the November 11, 2020 Regular Meeting and Public
33 Hearing minutes as presented. Perry Green supported the motion. Motion carried by unanimous
34 voice vote.
35

36 **OLD BUSINESS #1: Animal Units:**
37

38 Chairman Stickel indicated that the topic would be discussed during the upcoming public hearing
39 at 7:30 pm. He suggested temporarily deferring the item and moving on to Old Business Item
40 #2, Accessory Structure Standards, until the public hearing begins. No opposition was
41 expressed.
42

43 Rich Erickson made a motion to amend the agenda, moving Old Business Item #2 before Old
44 Business Item #1. Kurt Schulze supported the motion. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.
45

46 *The item was temporarily deferred.*

47
48 **OLD BUSINESS #2: Accessory Structure Standards:**
49

50 Chairman Stickel opened discussion with a brief summary of the topic. He asked Ross
51 Nicholson if he could guide the Planning Commission through the document he had prepared
52 summarizing current accessory structure standards and noting areas that could potentially be
53 improved.
54

55 Ross Nicholson read through some of the existing accessory structure standards and made
56 comments. He suggested that the Planning Commission could potentially look into the
57 possibility of permitting accessory dwelling units (ADU's) concurrently with the review of
58 accessory structure standards. He indicated that there have been, and continue to be, frequent
59 inquiries from current and prospective residents regarding the possibility of permitting ADU's,
60 primarily for the purpose of caring for elderly relatives as an alternative to senior living/care
61 facilities. Kurt Schulze asked if potential ADU regulations could be applied to both attached and
62 detached structures being utilized as ADU's. Ross Nicholson indicated that it is currently
63 possible to create an attached addition to a dwelling that could potentially be utilized as an ADU,
64 however, the Zoning Ordinance currently requires that the addition would share common access
65 with the rest of the dwelling. He stated for clarification that the aforementioned method is
66 essentially just adding an additional bedroom, cooking facilities, and restroom to a single-family
67 dwelling. He stated that the majority of the requests the Township receives regarding ADU's are
68 specific to detached structures. He indicated that one of the most common recent explanations as
69 to why residents have a desire to build ADU's is for use by elderly/disabled relatives/friends as
70 an alternative to retirement homes and similar facilities. Rich Erickson asked if rezoning of
71 properties would be required in order to permit ADU's. Ross Nicholson indicated that most
72 municipalities treat ADU's as accessory uses within single-family zoning districts which would
73 not require properties to be rezoned. He stated that it is up to the Planning Commission and
74 Township Board to determine the most appropriate method for regulating ADU's based on the
75 specific conditions and needs of Tyrone Township. Dan Stickel asked if it would be more
76 appropriate to include potential ADU regulations in the Accessory Buildings and Structures
77 Provisions section of the Zoning Ordinance (Section 21.02) or to include them under a different
78 section. Ross Nicholson indicated that, in his opinion, he believes it would be most appropriate
79 to include potential ADU regulations in Section 21.02. He stated that the latest amendment to
80 the Section was to allow for detached accessory structures on adjacent lots under specific
81 circumstances, which prescribes specific criteria for such uses. He indicated that he believes the
82 Planning Commission can look at the standards in the section (21.02.H) as a reference to how
83 they could potentially incorporate new regulations for ADU's into Section 21.02. He stated that
84 he believes Section 21.02 to be the most appropriate area to include the potential regulations
85 because ADU's are directly associated with accessory structures.
86

87 Ross Nicholson continued to read through the accessory structure standards document. He read
88 through the various subsections in Section 21.02 and noted areas which could potentially be
89 considered for amendments. He noted that the setback requirements for accessory structures in
90 most zoning districts appear to be working adequately. He suggested that the Planning
91 Commission review the existing accessory structure setback requirements for each zoning
92 district to ensure they are appropriate and sufficiently address the current needs of residents and

93 property owners. He noted that the Master Plan update would be occurring in the near future and
94 recommended that the Planning Commission incorporate a discussion on existing increased
95 setback requirements at certain intersections in the Township. Ross Nicholson continued to read
96 through the document. He made note that the accessory structure standards regarding sight lines
97 is likely deficient because it allows for the Planning Commission to require increased setbacks
98 for the purpose of preserving adjacent sight lines but does not prescribe a process which would
99 require the Planning Commission to review every application for accessory structures on
100 waterfront properties. He recommended that the Planning Commission draft amendments to
101 accessory structure sight line standards concurrently with principal structure sight line standards
102 (a separate item on the Planning Commission Action List). He moved on to the setback
103 requirement for docks and open boat storage structures. He noted that he has not had to deal
104 with deck setbacks for the most part, primarily because they are typically considered temporary
105 structures which do not require Township or County permits. He stated that the Planning
106 Commission may want to discuss whether or not the current 10-foot setback for decks should be
107 changed. The Planning Commission briefly discussed.

108
109 Chairman Stickel recommended closing discussion on the topic to hold the scheduled public
110 hearing.

111
112 *Kurt Schulze made a motion to recess the regular meeting to hold the scheduled public hearing.*
113 *Rich Erickson Supported the motion. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.*

114
115 *The item was temporarily closed.*

116
117 *Chairman Stickel recessed the regular meeting and opened the public hearing at 7:31 pm.*

118
119 **PUBLIC HEARING #1: Animal Units:**

120
121 Chairman Stickel brought up the public hearing agenda on the shared screen and read the public
122 hearing notice:

123
124 *“Notice is hereby given the Tyrone Township Planning Commission will hold a Public Hearing*
125 *on Tuesday, January 12, 2021, beginning at 7:30 pm via Zoom teleconference. Information to*
126 *join this meeting will be posted to the Township’s website prior to the meeting. The purpose for*
127 *the Public Hearing is:*

128
129 *To receive public comments regarding proposed amendments to Zoning Ordinance #36:*
130 *Animal Units: Article 21, Section 21.28 – Stables and Animals, to revise the requirements and*
131 *standards for keeping of animals that are not pets in the Farming Residential (FR), Rural Estate*
132 *(RE), and Single Family Residential (R-1) zoning districts.*

133
134 *Additional information is available at the Tyrone Township Clerk’s Office, 8420 Runyan Lake*
135 *Road, Monday through Thursday, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. Individuals with disabilities requiring*
136 *auxiliary aids or services should contact the Tyrone Township Clerk, at (810) 629-8631, at least*
137 *seven days prior to the meeting.”*

138 Chairman Stickel brought the draft amendment document up on the shared screen. He explained
139 that the intent of the proposed amendments is to allow the keeping of certain animals for private
140 use on properties under three (3) acres in area, which would not be permitted under the current
141 standards. He asked if anyone would like to add to his statement regarding intent. Ross
142 Nicholson added that the proposed animal unit amendments are intended to improve the ability
143 to regulate the keeping of animals for private by creating more specific categories and weighted
144 unit factors. He stated that the proposed unit factors would allow for a mixture of different
145 animals on smaller parcels which would not be possible under the current regulations. He cited
146 an example for reference; under the current standards, if a property was three acres in area, a
147 person could keep either one (1) horse or thirty (30) chickens. He stated that the proposed
148 amendments would allow for animal categories to be “mixed” on similar-sized properties. Under
149 the proposed regulations, a 3-acre parcel could accommodate 1 horse and 30 chickens as long as
150 the standards are met. He stated that the proposed text amendments are intended to both better
151 regulate the keeping of animals for private use and strengthen the ability to control potential
152 nuisance factors.

153
154 Chairman Stickel brought up the draft Animal Unit Calculation Table on the shared screen. He
155 explained how the proposed animal unit factors correspond to the various animal types and how
156 it would allow the Township to better determine what a reasonable number of specific types of
157 animals may be based on parcel size and the ability to prevent potential nuisance factors. Kurt
158 Schulze noted that the proposed animal unit factors were determined by the Planning
159 Commission based on the Michigan Department of Agriculture and Rural Development
160 (MDARD) Generally Accepted Agriculture and Management Practices (GAAMPs) as well as
161 research into similar ordinances. Ross Nicholson added that Dave Wardin, the former Planning
162 Commission Secretary, put a great deal of time and effort into drafting the original draft
163 amendment documents.

164
165 Chairman Stickel asked if there were any members of the public in attendance who wished to ask
166 questions or make public comment. Brian Hogue (resident) stated that he had no specific
167 comments or questions but is interested in the outcome of the public hearing.

168
169 Chairman Stickel asked the Planning Commission if they had any questions or comments
170 pertaining to the proposed amendments. Perry Green stated that he did not have any questions or
171 comments. Rich Erickson stated that he believes the proposed amendments would benefit
172 current and future residents because many people choose to move to the area for larger yards and
173 a rural environment, including the ability to keep animals for private use.

174
175 Dan Stickel asked Ross Nicholson if he had any comments to questions. Ross Nicholson
176 indicated that he believes the proposed amendments have been reviewed thoroughly and be a
177 significant improvement over the existing standards. He stated that he has had the opportunity to
178 provide the draft document to every resident/property owner who has inquired and, so far, has
179 not received any negative feedback.

180
181 Dan Stickel indicated that, if recommended for approval, the draft amendments would be
182 forwarded to the Livingston County Planning Commission (LCPC) for review and comment
183 prior to being sent to the Township Board. The Township Board would then review the

184 recommendations from the Planning Commission and LCPC, prior to considering
185 approval/adoption or denial of the proposed amendments.

186
187 Chairman Stickel asked again if any members of the public or the Planning Commission had any
188 additional questions or comments prior to closing the public hearing. No questions or comments
189 were received.

190
191 Kurt Schulze made a motion to close the public hearing. Rich Erickson supported the motion.
192 Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

193
194 Kurt Schulze made a motion to return to the regular meeting agenda. Rich Erickson supported
195 the motion. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

196
197 *Chairman Stickel closed the public hearing at 7:42 pm.*

198
199 **OLD BUSINESS #2: Accessory Structure Standards (continued):**

200
201 Chairman Stickel brought up the accessory structure standards document on the shared screen.
202 He indicated that the discussion left off on the topic of setbacks for waterfront docks and open
203 boat storage structures. He asked the Planning Commission if there were any additional
204 questions or comments on that topic. None were received.

205
206 Chairman Stickel recommended that Ross Nicholson continue reading through the document.
207 Ross Nicholson moved on to the topic of accessory structures constructed prior to principal
208 structures. He indicated that the topic comes up fairly frequently, primarily in instances where
209 property owners wish to move closer to their property during construction of new homes. He
210 stated that most people who inquire about the ability to erect an accessory structure prior to
211 completion of a principal structure wish to do so for the purpose of storing personal belongings,
212 construction materials, and equipment while their dwelling is being constructed. He stated that
213 the scenario is even more common for those property owners acting as general contractors for the
214 construction of their homes. He stated that the current standards allow for accessory structures to
215 be built prior to construction of a principal structure as long as the construction of principal
216 structure is completed within one (1) year. He stated that, the current standards can sometimes
217 be complied with but, in many cases, due to a number of variables such as availability of
218 materials/labor and financial factors, it is not always possible. He stated that it is possible for the
219 Township to allow for extensions, but there is not a clearly defined path for requesting such
220 extensions. He recommended that the Planning Commission review the existing standards and
221 determine whether or not the timeframe should be modified and evaluate whether or not there are
222 any other deficiencies that should be addressed. Kurt Schulze agreed that the Planning
223 Commission should consider amending the subsection especially because of current economic
224 factors.

225
226 Ross Nicholson continued reading through the document, moving on to the topic of temporary,
227 incidental, and exempt accessory structures. He pointed out that he believes the current
228 standards to be deficient in terms of clearly defining temporary structures. He stated that the
229 current definition for temporary structures are those structures “that do not require permanent

230 attachment to the ground, but have similar characteristics to an accessory structure...”. He
231 indicated he believes the definition could possibly be expanded for clarification purposes. Kurt
232 Schulze asked how large carport-like structures designed to store boats and recreational vehicles
233 are treated under the current standards. Ross Nicholson explained that the current standards
234 require that such structures comply with the same requirements as permanent structures
235 including number, size, lot coverage, and setback requirements. He stated that the biggest
236 difference between permanent and temporary accessory structures is that temporary structures do
237 not require land use or building permits. The Planning Commission briefly discussed.
238

239 Ross Nicholson moved on to the topic of incidental accessory structures, which are currently
240 defined as “One (1) accessory building or structure one hundred (100) square feet or less shall be
241 allowed per lot without a land use permit, and shall not count as one of the permitted accessory
242 structures on a lot.” He stated that the Livingston County Building Department does not require
243 building permits for accessory structures under two hundred (200) square feet in floor area and
244 the need for storage for most residents is constantly increasing. He stated that allowing residents
245 the ability to store belongings indoors could potentially alleviate some of the outdoor storage
246 issues facing many people, especially in the higher density residential zoning districts (such as
247 security and property aesthetics). He stated that he has not found the current standards to be
248 problematic in his experience, but he recommended that the Planning Commission should
249 discuss the maximum size and number of incidental accessory structures permitted to determine
250 whether or not they could be improved. The Planning Commission briefly discussed.
251

252 Ross Nicholson moved on to the topic of exempt structures. He stated that he believes the
253 Planning Commission should review the subsection and consider adding additional items such as
254 whole-home generators and retaining walls. He stated that whole-home generators and retaining
255 walls are not currently addressed in the Zoning Ordinance. He stated that the Planning
256 Commission should discuss and determine if the aforementioned items should be considered as
257 exempt structures or if they should otherwise be regulated in a separate section. The Planning
258 Commission briefly discussed.
259

260 Ross Nicholson moved on to the topic of regulations for specific accessory structures,
261 specifically gazebos. He stated that he is not certain as to why gazebos are regulated separately
262 from all permanent accessory structures. He stated that his best guess is that gazebos were
263 intended to be treated as incidental accessory structures. He provided the example that if a
264 property owner was limited to 1 detached structure and wanted to build a detached garage and a
265 gazebo, they would be forced to choose one or the other (assuming the gazebo exceeds 100
266 square feet in floor area). He stated that the Planning Commission should discuss the topic and
267 determine whether or not gazebos should be treated as accessory structure or incidental
268 accessory structures and determine whether or not the existing dimensional standards are
269 appropriate. Ross Nicholson moved on to the topic of swimming pools. He indicated that the
270 current setback requirements for swimming pools in all residential districts is a minimum of
271 twenty (20) feet from the side and rear property lines. He stated that he has not received any
272 objections or found any significant issues with the current setback requirements for swimming
273 pools. He stated that he recommends that the Planning Commission review the setback
274 requirements for pools because the current setback was adopted during a time when all pools
275 required fully-fenced enclosures. He noted that the State of Michigan and Livingston County

276 now recognize the use of specific automatic pool safety covers to be used in lieu of full-fenced
277 enclosures, so the setback requirement should be reviewed to ensure it is still adequate to protect
278 public health and safety.

279
280 Chairman Stickel moved on to the topic of FR (Farming Residential) and RE (Rural Estate)
281 zoning district accessory structure standards. He asked Ross Nicholson to read through the
282 section and elaborate. Ross Nicholson stated that the Accessory Building & Structures
283 Regulations Summary in the Zoning Ordinance (between Article 21 and Article 21A) states that
284 accessory structures may be located in a front yard location on RE zoned waterfront properties.
285 He stated that the summary document is intended as only a reference and indicates that the
286 ordinance text should be referenced for applicable regulations. He stated that he believes, based
287 on the summary page and common sense, that it was originally intended that accessory structures
288 should be permitted in front yard locations on RE waterfront properties, which would be
289 consistent with the standards for waterfront properties in all other residential zoning districts. He
290 recommended that the Planning Commission should discuss whether or not a front yard location
291 for detached accessory structures on waterfront properties is appropriate and, if so, insert
292 language into the FR and RE accessory structure standards.

293
294 Ross Nicholson made note of a subsection regarding detached accessory structure yard location
295 requirements based on the location of any attached accessory structures that are part of the
296 principal structure. He stated that the language is mostly consistent in all residential zoning
297 districts. He recommended that the Planning Commission review these yard location standards
298 in all residential zoning districts to determine whether or not they should be clarified or
299 modified.

300
301 Ross Nicholson continued through the document, moving on to the topic of front yard accessory
302 structures. He stated that the topic frequently comes up due to a number of factors, the most
303 common being that some properties cannot feasibly erect detached structures due to the location
304 of a principal structure. He stated that there are many properties with principal structures set
305 back towards the far rear of a property, creating extensive front yard area but limiting potential
306 rear yard locations. He stated that he has seen many properties that are configured in such a way
307 due to factors such as location of septic and well due to soil percolation test results, privacy,
308 aesthetics, topography/significant natural features, etc. He stated that most of these properties
309 are located in the FR and RE districts. He stated that under the current standards, front yard
310 accessory structures are only permitted on waterfront properties and FR or RE zoned properties
311 that are at least twenty (20) acres or more in area with at least four hundred and sixty-six (466)
312 feet of road frontage, at least two hundred and fifty (250) feet separation from the principal
313 structure, and at least one hundred and fifty (150) foot setback from the road right-of-way
314 (ROW). He stated that front yard location variances have been very common over the past
315 several years. He indicated that there are very few remaining properties that could be eligible for
316 front yard accessory structures under the current standards. He noted that the current standards
317 date back to the 1965 Zoning Ordinance and it is questionable as to whether or not the eligibility
318 requirements are appropriate. He suggested that the Planning Commission should review the
319 existing standards to determine whether or not they are still appropriate and propose revisions, if
320 necessary.

321

322 Ross Nicholson moved on to the requirement for a minimum of ten (10) foot separation between
323 all detached accessory structures and the principal structure. He stated that he has not yet
324 researched whether or not the State Building Code requires a minimum setback between
325 detached structures and dwellings. He recommended that, assuming there is not a specific
326 separation required by the Building Code, the Planning Commission should review and
327 determine whether or not 10 feet is the appropriate distance. Rich Erickson stated that the
328 requirement may be in place to reduce potential risk of fire. Ross Nicholson indicated that he
329 assumes the same. Chairman Stickel stated that the item can be discussed after determining
330 whether or not it is controlled by either building code or fire code.

331
332 Ross Nicholson moved on to the topic of building size limitations in higher density residential
333 zoning districts such as R-1 (Single Family Residential) and LK-1 (Lakefront Residential). He
334 indicated that this is probably the most frequently brought up topic in terms of accessory
335 structure standards. He stated that in R-1 and LK-1, there is a limit of 1 detached accessory
336 structure that is limited in size to eight hundred (800) square feet or less in floor area. He stated
337 that there is a mechanism in the Ordinance that would allow people to modify the maximum floor
338 area requirement to allow up to twelve-hundred (1,200) square feet and modify the height
339 requirement to up to two (2) feet greater than generally permitted as long as it is approved by the
340 Planning Commission following formal review and public hearing (as described in Section
341 21.02.G). He stated that the process to modify requirements is frequently applied for and the
342 applications are almost always approved. He stated that, in his experience, the vast majority of
343 residents who are building detached accessory structures prefer to build the largest size possible.
344 He stated that, there are people who dislike the appearance of accessory structures larger than
345 800 square feet in floor area, however, most people would prefer a large enclosed structure than
346 equipment and belongings being stored outdoors. He indicated that it may be worth discussing
347 whether or not the 800 square foot maximum size is still appropriate and whether or not the
348 special process for permitting up to 1,200 square feet is still necessary. He explained that he has
349 heard from some residents that large accessory structures can diminish the aesthetics/residential
350 appearance of certain neighborhoods, so the topic is not simply black & white. There are
351 definitely a number of important factors that should be considered when reviewing the existing
352 standards and determining whether or not they should be modified.

353
354 Ross Nicholson moved on to the topic of design standards for accessory structures in the R-1, R-
355 2, and LK-1 zoning districts. He stated that the standards are fairly relaxed and have not
356 presented any significant issues historically. He stated that the biggest issue, in his opinion, is
357 the fact that the text implies that some pole barns may not be permitted if they have industrial or
358 agricultural finishes. He stated that there are now plenty of options for pole barns and steel
359 buildings to be designed to be residential in appearance which may have not existed/been
360 commonly used during the time that the subsection was written. He stated that the Township
361 allows post and beam/pole barn construction to be utilized for single-family dwellings (subject to
362 compliance with design requirements and State Building Code) and he has seen a number of new
363 pole barn structures that are almost indistinguishable in exterior appearance than conventional
364 stick-built detached accessory structures. He suggested that the Planning Commission review
365 the text and determine whether or on to the language can be improved for the sake of clarity.
366

367 Ross Nicholson moved on to the next topic regarding the maximum number of detached
368 accessory structures on properties zoned LK-1. He stated that this topic is another that comes up
369 frequently, specifically on the long narrow lakefront properties located on Runyan lake and Lake
370 Tyrone. He stated that he receives inquiries from property owners in LK-1 wishing to build
371 secondary detached accessory structures for the purpose of storing watercraft and other
372 belongings. Many lakefront properties exist within the Township that are approximately forty
373 (40) to one hundred (100) feet in width and approximately one thousand (1,000) feet in length.
374 Many of the properties are wooded, screened, or have significant land area between road
375 frontage and where structure are/could be located. For this reason, owners of similar properties
376 often ask the question as to why it would be inappropriate to build a structure that would create
377 little to no adverse effect to the community but would benefit their property by allowing for
378 additional indoor storage. He recommended that the Planning Commission could research some
379 of these lakefront properties to determine whether or not it would be appropriate to establish
380 minimum eligibility requirements and standards to potentially allow for additional structures
381 where they would not negatively impact existing residential development. The Planning
382 Commission briefly discussed.

383
384 Ross Nicholson continued through the document. He summarized the existing standards for
385 detached accessory structures on adjacent lots. He indicated that the mechanism to allow for
386 such uses has only been utilized one time since it's adoption. He stated, in his opinion, that the
387 text hasn't existed long enough/been utilized enough to accurately gauge its effectiveness. He
388 stated that the Planning Commission can definitely review and potentially modify the standards
389 if they find any deficiencies or others areas that could be improved.

390
391 Chairman Stickel thanked Ross Nicholson for preparing and presenting the information. He
392 asked the Planning Commission if anyone had thoughts or opinions on how to proceed with
393 future discussion on the topic of accessory structure standards. None were received. He
394 suggested including the topic on the agenda consistently for future meetings and work on the
395 potential amendments piece by piece as opposed to tackling everything all at once. Rich
396 Erickson suggested asking the Township Board their feelings on prioritizing accessory structure
397 topics. Chairman Stickel indicated that they intend to discuss the topic with the Township Board
398 during the next joint meeting with the Planning Commission. Ross Nicholson indicated that the
399 topic has been on the Planning Commission Action List for approximately four (4) years, during
400 which time, the Township Board has consistently felt that it should be reviewed. He stated that
401 he believes there to be some flexibility in terms of the timeframe to complete proposed
402 amendments. Kurt Schulze indicated that, from the perspective of the Township Board, they
403 believe the accessory structure standards should be a higher priority topic than some of the other
404 items on the Action List, such as sign regulations. He continued, stating that any applications
405 received by the Planning Commission would take priority over proposed text amendments. He
406 stated that he believes it will be best for the Planning Commission to thoroughly review the topic
407 to ensure the end result adequately meets the needs of the Township and its residents. Chairman
408 Stickel agreed. He asked if the Planning Commission had any additional thoughts or comments
409 on the topic. None were received.

410

411 Rich Erickson made a motion to recommend Township Board approval of the proposed Keeping
412 of Animals text amendments and Animal Unit Calculation Table (Animal Units). Kurt Schulze
413 supported the motion. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

414
415 *The item was closed.*

416
417 **NEW BUSINESS #1: Agri-Business Special Land Use Standards:**

418
419 Chairman Stickel briefly summarized the topic. He stated that the Township Board has received
420 a request to consider limited United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) certified meat
421 processing operation in conjunction with a proposed Agri-business special land use for an
422 organic farm market (retail facility). The Township Board has requested that the Planning
423 Commission review the existing standards for such uses and determine whether or not it would
424 be possible to amend the standards to allow for the proposed uses. He indicated that research
425 into the topic has not yet started. He suggested deferring the item until the next workshop
426 meeting.

427
428 The Planning Commission briefly discussed timing for reviewing recently received applications
429 and selection of a new planning consultant.

430
431 *The item was closed.*

432
433 **CALL TO THE PUBLIC:**

434
435 Chairman Stickel asked if there were any public questions or comments. None were received.

436
437 *The item was closed.*

438
439 **MISCELLANIOUS BUSINESS #1: Next Workshop Meeting:**

440
441 A Workshop meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, January 20, 2021, beginning at 6:00 pm.

442
443 *The item was closed.*

444
445 *The meeting was adjourned at 8:37 pm by Chairman Stickel.*

COMMUNICATION #3

Planning Commission Approved Meeting
Minutes – February 9, 2021

**TYRONE TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING
APPROVED MINUTES
February 9, 2021**

Note: This meeting was held via electronic remote access (Zoom)

PRESENT: Chairman Dan Stickel, Vice-Chairman Kurt Schulze, Commissioners Rich Erickson, Jon Ward, Steve Krause and Bill Wood

ABSENT: Commissioner Perry Green

OTHERS PRESENT: Ross Nicholson

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order by Chairman Stickel at 7:00 pm.

Chairman Stickel acknowledged the large presence of public. He stated that anyone who wants to speak will be given the opportunity to do so. He said that at 7:30 the regular meeting activities will be suspended for a public hearing which is not related to what most people were there for.

He said that regarding the proposed asphalt plant and warehouse site, tonight's meeting was the first time that the Planning Commission as a whole was being introduced to this project. At this stage, no decisions have yet to be made and no approvals have been issued thus far. The applicant is here tonight to introduce the project to the Planning Commission and to get initial feedback from commissioners and the public. This project will very likely require many reviews and approvals from Tyrone Township as well as a myriad of other agencies and no consideration for final approval will be made until approvals from other agencies have been secured. At the appropriate time during tonight's meeting, the public will have a chance to speak.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

CALL TO THE PUBLIC:

Chairman Stickel asked if there were any members of the public in attendance who would like to ask any questions or make public comments about anything not on the agenda.

No public comments or questions were received.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

The minutes for approval on this agenda were not ready yet, so Chairman Stickel suggested the approval of the minutes be removed from the agenda. Steve Krause moved to approve the agenda as amended, Rich Erickson supported. The motion carried.

OLD BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS:

1) Newman TTP Rezoning (Parcel #4704-17-400-007)

Chairman Stickel explained that this is part of the parcel that is proposed to be developed into an asphalt plant & warehouse. It is the first step of many that will have to be taken.

Abby Cooper, the attorney for the developer of the proposed plant on the parcel ending in -007, explained the application. She explained that she represents Jon Sawyer, the developer, who was also present at the meeting. Mr. Sawyer is the owner of Capital Asphalt in Lansing. He is also the owner of Tri-State Development which develops warehouses, which would be designed for the southern 30 acres of the site. Also present was Capital Asphalt superintendent, Darren Zimmerman, as well as their engineer, TJ Dori. Dan Callan was also present, representing Newman TTP. He was there in support of the current application and also the sister application - the rezoning of the -001 parcel, the 74 acres to the north.

Chairman Stickel shared the application on his screen for the public to see and asked Ms. Cooper to walk them through it.

Ms. Cooper explained that they are requesting the 50-acre parcel (4707-17-400-007), which is located north of Center Road, be rezoned from FR (Farming Residential) to M-2 (Heavy Industrial). The next item is for the 74-acre parcel to the north of that to also be rezoned from FR to M-2.

Most of the considerations that support the rezoning on -007 would apply to -001 as well.

Ms. Cooper continued to explain their request and stated that the properties immediately to the west and to the south are zoned M-1 and house the TRW Auto Parts Manufacturer Plant. When you look at the Master Plan, it is master-planned for industrial use. Parcel -007 is 50 acres, and the project that is being proposed is on the 30 most southern acres of that parcel. The developer has plans to develop the new parcel into an asphalt plant on the inner part of the parcel with three warehouses along the Old US-23 road front as phase one. The planned warehouses are anticipated to be approximately 12,000 square feet each and would be a permitted use in the M-2 district. The asphalt plant would be permitted as a special land use in the M-2 district with additional requirements as set forth in Tyrone Township's Zoning Ordinance #36, section 22.05 (O). The last ten acres are noted on the site plan as phase two; it is likely to include future, similarly-sized warehouses. This is only if they are successful in rezoning the properties.

She said that when looking at the rezoning, they aren't looking at the project specifics. They look at the rezoning in general and what makes sense for this area. In the application, they walk through the criteria that the Planning Commission is going to look at. When looking through all the criteria in Zoning Ordinance section 29.04.A, rezoning from FR to M-2 meets all those criteria. Most critical for the Planning Commission's review is whether it is consistent with the Master Plan and the Future Land Use Map. After reviewing these things, they felt there is no better spot in the Township than this proposed parcel to rezone to M-2. In the Master Plan and the Future Land Use Map, the Township specifically states that along the US-23 corridor is where they want industrial growth to be. It is favored in this area because of sewers, the access to the highway & putting an industrial use where there already exists industrial use – the TRW

plant. Putting the industrial use there will preserve the rural character of the township. The Master Plan says that a number of times; that putting non-residential uses in the place that makes the most sense where non-residential uses are supposed to go preserves the rural character of the township as a whole. The number one area pegged for nonresidential use is the US-23 corridor.

Another thing the Planning Commission must look at when considering a rezoning is the return on investment. What would the current landowner be able to do with the property at its current zoning versus the proposed rezoning? Infrastructure impact is another issue the Planning Commission needs to consider. A traffic study has been submitted with the application. The Planning Commission also needs to look at the surrounding uses. Will the proposed use be similar to the surrounding existing uses? She said it would be very consistent with what is existing. There is no other M-2 zoning in the Township. So where would it make sense to put an M-2? Right next to an M-1.

The last thing they need to look at is demand. Do we have a demand for this kind of use and if so, where should we put it? The Master Plan says “US-23 corridor”. The demand for industrial use is a good revenue generator for the Township. This kind of use is not prevalent in the county.

Chairman Stickel explained that they were going to discuss the application with the applicants, and then they will open it up to the public for comments.

Commissioner Rich Erickson asked about the traffic impact study. Ms. Cooper stated that it was included in the application (exhibit F).

Commissioner Steve Krause wanted an explanation that a granting of rezoning doesn't mean an approval of the asphalt plant. Planning & Zoning Administrator Ross Nicholson explained that while the applications can be tied together, and that it is nice that the Township has an idea of what is proposed should the rezoning be approved, the rezoning itself is a separate issue from the Special Land Use.

Commissioner Kurt Schulze said we needed to point out that we don't currently have M-2 zoning in the Master Plan. The TRW plant is zoned M-1, light industrial. The asphalt plant would be zoned M-2, heavy industrial. This is a request for something that currently is not in the Master Plan (future land use map). We would have to determine if it is appropriate to reclassify M-1 property and FR into M-2.

Commissioner Jon Ward asked what it showed on the Master Plan; it was determined that is currently shown as PIRO – Planned Industrial Research and Office. Nicholson said the Township has never initiated any rezoning for PIRO. Krause asked Nicholson if an asphalt plant would be allowed in M-1 zoning, even as a Special Land Use. Nicholson said that it would be permitted as a Special Land Use in M-1.

Schulze moved to suspend the meeting to begin the public hearing portion of the meeting. Krause supported. Motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS:

4) Villiard Accessory Structure Floor Area Increase

Chairman Stickel read aloud the public hearing notice. The applicant, Mr. Villiard, explained that he would like to build a 1,200 square foot pole barn.

The neighbors directly to the north of Mr. Villiard were opposed to having the barn in the proposed location, and Krause asked if he could move the barn further to the east. Mr. Villiard stated there was a gas line 93 feet from his house and he didn't want the barn so far from his house, as he intends to park in it. He was asked if he could move it to the other side of the driveway, but he stated he couldn't because the main sewer line goes through there. He was asked if he could move the barn to the east of the gas line, and he said it would block his entire driveway if he did. Chairman Stickel asked Mr. Villiard about the existing structure on his property for which the township has no record. He stated it would be removed once his new barn was done. Chairman Stickel stated that if he is approved, it would be conditional upon removal of the existing structure. Krause said he was concerned with the residents to the north, the proposed location of his barn is right up next to their porch. He said he would like to see it moved more to the east. Ward agreed, he said he'd like to see him move it in line with their neighbor's garage. Villiard said he would have to clear-cut about 12 trees that are there. Also, it's very low and wet in the spring. Chairman Stickel agreed that is a good reason not to put it there. Mr. Villiard said he has always had issues with the neighbors to the north. He said this barn won't block their view of the lake.

The neighbor to the south talked about how his and most of the neighbor's detached structures are located back further on the property and mostly in line with other barns.

Nicholson recommended that the Planning Commission review the decision criteria for increasing the size of a detached accessory structure in the zoning ordinance. Chairman Stickel read aloud section 21.02.G. It was determined that most of the criteria were met except the last one which talks about the compatibility of accessory structure appearance with any residential principal and accessory buildings on nearby lots. Chairman Stickel said they should focus on that factor, a lot of the pole barns around the applicant's property are in line, and there are more than three which establishes a pattern. While he understands why Mr. Villiard wants the structure closer to his home, but he feels they need to follow the ordinance and be considerate of neighbors. The other commissioners agreed with Chairman Stickel.

After some more discussion regarding the location of the proposed structure, Krause moved to conditionally approve Mr. Villard's request for a 1,200 square foot accessory structure conditional upon removal of the existing detached accessory structure, and a revised site plan approved by the Planning Commission subcommittee. Schulze supported. The motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS:

2) Newman TTP Rezoning (Parcel #4704-17-400-001)

Dan Callan, who represents Newman TTP, LLC on both properties, explained the purpose of the application. He said this requested rezoning of the second parcel is to continue the zoning north of the potential asphalt plant and the 50 acres for a similar use as the asphalt plant. He said they

don't have any specific plans for the property to the north. In this application, they have reserved the northern 20 acres as a buffer to the adjacent residential property. That was part of what was described in the PIRO district description. There would be an adequate transition from the industrial to residential. The property has been on the market for over three years, this is the first serious interest. The Newmans committed to 249 REUs for this property; since that time, the Master Plan changed substantially. There is no way that this property would ever use anywhere near that many REUs. The Master Plan and the Sewer District were created before this administration was in place, so the Newmans were burdened with way more REUs than they could ever use. The only type of development that could use those REUs would be high-density residential on that property. There will never be demand for that type of use in this location. They said in the future they'd divide off some acreage at the road frontage to be used by small businesses. They feel this is consistent with the Master Plan. The property is properly buffered to the adjacent properties. They understand that people don't love industrial, but every community has an obligation to provide for industrial uses, along with other uses.

Chairman Stickel asked if the board and Nicholson had any questions or comments for Mr. Callan. There were none.

NEW BUSINESS:

3) Capital Asphalt Special Land Use

Ms. Cooper explained that the Special Land Use wouldn't come into play unless the rezoning moves forward. Upon approval of the rezoning, they would be requesting a warehouse use and asphalt plant in M-2 zoning. They would both be permitted in M-1 as well, and as well as in the PIRO district. Whether it's currently in the Master Plan, the Township has many ways to go about allowing these types of use. They are open to any input from the Planning Commission on the best way to proceed.

The site plan was shared on the screen and Ms. Cooper explained that it was a good glimpse of the southern 30 acres of -007. The northern 10 acres would be reserved for phase two, so right now they're talking about the southern 20 acres. The proposed ingress/egress is off of Old US-23. There will be landscaping for buffers. There are three 12,000 square foot warehouse buildings on the site plan. The area to the west will contain the asphalt plant. It would be located in the interior of the site and be immediately adjacent to the already existing industrial plant located to the south of this parcel.

Ms. Cooper acknowledged they are in the very preliminary stages and that they've not yet received all of the agency approvals that are needed.

She briefly discussed the Impact Assessment that was submitted with her packet. It acknowledges that there are some wetlands to the north of the 50-acres, but currently no wetlands on the proposed project area. It also talked about the appropriateness of the use in that area, the infrastructure, the sewers, and a drainage plan. There will be no hazardous materials on site. The asphalt is a seasonal use, and the warehouses will be very low impact.

Erickson asked them to explain how they'd dispose of waste and control the odor. Jon Sawyer of Capital Asphalt explained that the State of Michigan has an air quality division that monitors asphalt plants on almost a daily basis. Daily reports are submitted to the air quality department that requires that there is no pollution outside of the plant. If there is any waste it would be normal waste going into a regular dumpster. The main concern for the neighbors would be the air quality which is severely regulated by the State of Michigan. They have a department that handles that on all asphalt plants, they're very receptive to any violations.

There was a discussion regarding the number of trucks that would be running in and out of the plant. Mr. Sawyer said it could be anywhere between 20-30 trucks. Production is tied to the job they're working on. The trucks would only be driving a short distance from the plant to get onto the highway.

The Planning Commission further discussed with Mr. Sawyer the odor, the legal amount of emissions, the types of equipment that would be used in the plant, and the number of employees that would be employed by the plant.

CALL TO THE PUBLIC:

Chairman Stickel opened the public hearing at 8:54 pm. Many people in the audience spoke in opposition to the proposed asphalt plant and had questions for the applicants.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 pm by Chairman Stickel.

COMMUNICATION #4

Planning Commission Approved Meeting
Minutes – March 9, 2021

TYRONE TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
APPROVED REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
March 9, 2021

Note: This meeting was held via electronic remote access (Zoom)

PRESENT: Chairman Dan Stickel, Vice-Chairman Kurt Schulze, Commissioners Rich Erickson, Jon Ward, Steve Krause, Bill Wood and Perry Green

OTHERS PRESENT: Ross Nicholson, Karie Carter, and Kathleen Kline-Hudson

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order by Chairman Stickel at 7:00 pm.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

Vice-Chairman Schulze moved to approve the agenda as presented. Commissioner Krause seconded. The motion carried.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: 12/08/2020 Regular Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Krause moved to approve the 12/08/20 minutes, Commissioner Erickson supported. The motion carried.

OLD BUSINESS: Accessory Structure Standards.

Chairman Stickel shared his screen to show the document that Nicholson has been working on. He said no major revisions have taken place in 20 years or so and they want to bring the ordinance up to the standards the residents of the township want. He asked Nicholson to guide them through the discussion.

Nicholson said that in previous meetings they looked into increasing the accessory size for R-1, R-2, & LK-1.

Commissioner Ward asked if the new planner had been tasked with looking at this as well. Ross said that the township hired a new planning consultant and they will help with potential ordinance amendments but he feels this can be done at the planning commission level without much from the consultant. He said the last major amendments were made in 2012 and other than that it's virtually unchanged. Things like setbacks and yard location requirements have a lot of flexibility and are up to the Planning Commission and then ultimately the Board to determine what would be most appropriate for our community based on what we hear from residents, what the demands are, etc.

Nicholson walked through the list on the screen. One of the major things that people have been requesting is mother-in-law suites/accessory dwelling units (ADUs) as an alternative to the retirement home setting for elderly relatives or friends staying over. One of the main reasons this

hasn't been considered in the past is the potential for turning structures that could be considered ADUs into secondary dwelling units and then renting those dwellings for income. One potential mechanism to discourage the renting out of these dwellings is putting language in our ordinance which would limit the use of those structures to short term without compensation. Another way would be to require deed restrictions. That would be similar to what was done with accessory structures on adjacent lots. A couple of years ago, the township did a poll via the township email list to see who would be interested in mother-in-law suites and overwhelming positive input was received.

It was agreed that it is something that the Planning Commission should consider. Commissioner Schulze asked Nicholson about Airbnb rentals, and Nicholson said we have nothing in our ordinance addressing them at this time. Commissioner Krause asked what the enforcement mechanism would be if someone was renting out their ADU. Nicholson said that his understanding was that if it was in the deed, the Township would be the enforcement mechanism and they could take legal action against someone in violation.

Commissioner Green said it seems like such a reach for the local government to require deed restrictions. He said he'd like to see something a little less imposing. Nicholson stated that the majority of municipalities do not permit this use. If we, as a municipality, would be considering this above and beyond what most municipalities would permit, a deed restriction may be justified. Krause also stated that he wasn't comfortable with deed restrictions. He felt we could enforce using our ordinances. Nicholson stated that either way would be okay and that it is up to the Planning Commission to decide and to recommend to the Board. Chairman Stickel stated that regardless of the mechanism they chose for enforcement they need to take into consideration how much of a nuisance the rentals are or will be. If they present major nuisance factors, then maybe deed restrictions are needed; if not, then just an ordinance might be fine.

Commissioner Erickson asked if anyone had ever applied for a special land use or a variance for an ADU. Nicholson said that we don't consider use variances, so going the ZBA route would not be an option. We don't have any specific provisions to consider it, we have not permitted it. There is not a mechanism for a resident to appeal on this particular use. Ward asked what the results of the survey regarding mother-in-law suites were; Nicholson guessed that we got around 50 responses. Most of those responses were in favor of it with the necessary safeguards in place. The board continued their discussion regarding ADUs and Chairman Stickel felt it was something they should consider. Nicholson was tasked with creating a rough draft of language addressing ADUs.

The board further discussed the accessory structures ordinances and the changes and updates that may be needed.

NEW BUSINESS: Annual Livingston County Planning Department Visit

Kathleen Kline-Hudson, Director of the Livingston County Planning Department (LCPD), spoke to the Planning Commission and provided updates on various topics the LCPD is currently involved in/will be working on in the future. Some of the topics she discussed were the

Livingston County Trails Plan, the new county park opened in Genoa Township, ADU language in their Master Plan, a proposed sports field, and their brown bag lunch program.

Chairman Stickel thanked her for sharing the information with the Planning Commission.

CALL TO THE PUBLIC: Multiple residents voiced their opposition to the proposed asphalt company during public comments. There was also some public discussion regarding ADUs.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned by Chairman Stickel at 9:00 pm.

APPROVED

COMMUNICATION #5

Emergency Services Report – May 2021

EMERGENCY SERVICES BILLED TO TYRONE TOWNSHIP

	CITY OF FENTON		FENTON TWP		HARTLAND		MONTHLY \$ TOTALS	BILLABLE
	# RUNS	\$1,447.00	# RUNS	\$1,447.00	# RUNS	\$1,447.00		
	# MEDICAL	\$400.00	# MEDICAL	\$400.00	# MEDICAL	\$400.00		
	#EXCEPTION	\$500.00	#EXCEPTION	\$500.00	#EXCEPTION	\$500.00		
Apr-21	(3) 14	\$20,258	(1) 9	\$13,023	(1) 15	\$21,705	\$54,986	5 \$7,235
May-21	8	\$11,576	(2) 12	\$17,364	(1) 3	\$4,341		
Jun-21								
Jul-21								
Aug-21								
Sep-21								
Oct-21								
Nov-21								
Dec-21								
Jan-22								
Feb-22								
Mar-22								
Excp								
MED								
YTD TOTALS		\$23,258		\$30,387		\$21,705	\$57,986	\$7,235
YTD RUNS	22		21		15			5
YTD Excp								
YTD MED								
					<i>Incomplete partial invoice May 1-15</i>			

**CITY OF FENTON FIRE RUNS
COLLECTION ACCOUNTS**

INCIDENT DATE	INCIDENT #	BALANCE	STATUS
Feb-16	53	\$1,391.00	COLLECTIONS
Feb-16	62	\$1,391.00	COLLECTIONS
Mar-16	76	\$1,391.00	COLLECTIONS
Aug-15	283	\$350.00	COLLECTIONS
Oct-15	354	\$390.00	COLLECTIONS
Jun-16	197	\$1,391.00	COLLECTIONS
Jun-16	225	\$1,391.00	COLLECTIONS
Jun-16	226	\$1,391.00	COLLECTIONS
Jul-16	285	\$1,391.00	COLLECTIONS
Jul-16	296	\$1,391.00	COLLECTIONS
Sep-16	371	\$1,391.00	COLLECTIONS
Aug-16	436	\$1,391.00	COLLECTIONS
Nov-16	461	\$1,391.00	COLLECTIONS
Jan-17	49	\$1,391.00	COLLECTIONS
Mar-17	371	\$1,391.00	COLLECTIONS
Mar-17	120	\$400.00	COLLECTIONS
Mar-17	125	\$1,391.00	COLLECTIONS
Jun-17	235	\$1,405.00	COLLECTIONS
Jul-17	318	\$400.00	COLLECTIONS
Jul-17	328	\$1,405.00	COLLECTIONS
Oct-17	431	\$1,405.00	COLLECTIONS
Nov-17	468	\$1,405.00	COLLECTIONS
Nov-17	483	\$1,405.00	COLLECTIONS
Jan-18	22	\$1,405.00	COLLECTIONS
Jan-18	27	\$1,405.00	COLLECTIONS
Mar-18	117	\$1,405.00	COLLECTIONS
Jul-18	296	\$1,419.00	COLLECTIONS
Nov-18	438	\$1,419.00	COLLECTIONS
Nov-18	484	\$1,419.00	COLLECTIONS
Apr-18	161	\$1,024.00	COLLECTIONS
Feb-18	80	\$327.25	COLLECTIONS
Aug-19	327	\$1,319.00	COLLECTIONS
Oct-19	401	\$1,419.00	COLLECTIONS
Nov-19	447	\$1,419.00	COLLECTIONS

**CITY OF FENTON FIRE RUNS
COLLECTION ACCOUNTS**

Aug-20	286	\$1,433.00	COLLECTIONS
Jul-17	306	\$485.00	COLLECTIONS
Nov-20	391	\$1,433.00	COLLECTIONS
Nov-20	416	\$1,433.00	COLLECTIONS

HARTLAND OUTSTANDING FIRE RUNS

INCIDENT DATE	INCIDENT #	BALANCE	STATUS
Sep-16	16-529	\$1,391.00	COLLECTIONS
Sep-16	16-530	\$1,391.00	COLLECTIONS
Oct-16	16-581	\$1,391.00	COLLECTIONS
17-Sep	17-660	\$1,405.00	COLLECTIONS
Dec-17	17-814	\$1,405.00	COLLECTIONS
Dec-17	17-869	\$1,405.00	COLLECTIONS
Jan-18	18-056	\$1,405.00	COLLECTIONS
Mar-18	18-189	\$1,405.00	COLLECTIONS
Jun-18	18-370	\$1,419.00	COLLECTIONS
Aug-18	18-598	\$1,419.00	COLLECTIONS
Jun-19	19-366	\$1,419.00	COLLECTIONS
Jul-19	19-513	\$1,419.00	COLLECTIONS
Nov-19	19-840	\$1,419.00	COLLECTIONS
Jan-20	20-035	\$1,419.00	COLLECTIONS
20-Feb	20-142	\$1,419.00	COLLECTIONS
Jun-20	20-0400	\$1,235.50	COLLECTIONS
Jul-20	20-0425	\$1,433.00	COLLECTIONS
Nov-20	20-736	\$1,433.00	COLLECTIONS
Jan-21	21-032	\$1,433.00	INVOICED
Jan-21	21-068	\$1,433.00	INVOICED
Feb-21	21-0113	\$1,433.00	INVOICED
Mar-21	21-0173	\$400.00	INVOICED
Apr-21	21-0268	\$1,447.00	INVOICED
May-21	21-0374	\$1,447.00	INVOICED



Copy

For Next Board mtg



UNIVERSAL CREDIT SERVICES, INC
P.O. BOX 133
HARTLAND, MI 48353
800-931-3711

1

RECEIVED
MAY 12 2021

INVOICE 033264
05/03/21

No. 95

UN10
TYR001 TYRONE TOWNSHIP FIRERUNS
8420 RUNYAN LAKE RD
NNEDNN FENTON, MI 48430

Date	Name / Ref No.	Sts	COLLECTIONS		Our Comm	Remain Princ	Net Amt Due
			Pd You	Pd Us			
04/09	BALL, JUSTIN D 20-0400	PAY		395.00		840.50	395.00-
04/09	BALL, JUSTIN D 20-0400	PAY		105.00	105.00	840.50	
04/01	DURISH, LAURA 0019061400	PDC		79.00		866.00	79.00-
04/01	DURISH, LAURA 0019061400	PDC		21.00	21.00	866.00	
04/26	FOX, PAUL THOMAS 0000080	PDC		59.25		327.25	59.25-
04/26	FOX, PAUL THOMAS 0000080	PDC		15.75	15.75	327.25	
04/12	WELTER, ADAM 19403	PDC		1.56		270.39	1.56-
04/12	WELTER, ADAM 19403	PDC		.42	.42	270.39	
					142.17		534.81-
				676.98			

Gross Collections This Cycle.....\$676.98

Check No. 016564 Enclosed.....\$534.81



PO BOX 158
HARTLAND, MI 48353-0158
800-931-3711
www.ucscollections.com

Closed Report
Accounts Closed From 4/1/2021 Thru 4/30/2021

RECEIVED
MAY 12 2021

TYR001
TYRONE TOWNSHIP
Attn: MARIAN KRAUSE
8420 RUNYAN LAKE RD

FENTON, MI 48430

Reference #	Close Reason	Account Name	Assign Date	Closed Date	Amount Cancelled
15156	UNCOLLECTIBLE	ODOM,HEATHER	08/30/16	04/05/21	1,582.73
Totals	1				



UNIVERSAL CREDIT SERVICES, INC
 P.O. BOX 133
 HARTLAND, MI 48353
 800-931-3711

1

INVOICE 033394
 06/01/21

No. 89

RECEIVED
 JUN 09 2021

TYR001 UN10 TYRONE TOWNSHIP FIRERUNS
 8420 RUNYAN LAKE RD
 NNEDNN FENTON, MI 48430

Date	Name / Ref No.	Sts	COLLECTIONS		Our Comm	Remain Princ	Net Amt Due
			Pd	You Pd Us			
05/14	BALL, JUSTIN D 20-0400	PPB		197.50		643.00	197.50-
05/14	BALL, JUSTIN D 20-0400	PPB		52.50	52.50	643.00	
05/06	DAGENAIS, STEVEN MATHEW 0000447	PAY		158.00		1261.00	158.00-
05/06	DAGENAIS, STEVEN MATHEW 0000447	PAY		42.00	42.00	1261.00	
05/03	DURISH, LAURA 0019061400	PDC		79.00		787.00	79.00-
05/03	DURISH, LAURA 0019061400	PDC		21.00	21.00	787.00	
05/26	FOX, PAUL THOMAS 0000080	PDC		59.25		268.00	59.25-
05/26	FOX, PAUL THOMAS 0000080	PDC		15.75	15.75	268.00	
05/11	WELTER, ADAM 19403	PDC		1.01		269.38	1.01-
05/11	WELTER, ADAM 19403	PDC		.27	.27	269.38	
	SubTotals				131.52		494.76-
	SubTotals			626.28			

Gross Collections This Cycle.....\$626.28

Check No. 016644 Enclosed.....\$494.76



UNIVERSAL CREDIT SERVICES, INC
 P.O. BOX 133
 HARTLAND, MI 48353
 800-931-3711

1

INVOICE 033395
 06/01/21

* RECAP *

No. 89

UN10
 TYR001 TYRONE TOWNSHIP FIRERUNS
 8420 RUNYAN LAKE RD
 NNEDNN FENTON, MI 48430

Date	Name / Ref No.	Sts	COLLECTIONS		Our	Remain	Net Amt		
			Pd	You	Pd	Us	Comm	Princ	Due
	Totals						131.52		494.76-
	Totals			626.28					

Gross Collections This Cycle.....\$626.28

Total Enclosed Checks.....\$494.76



PO BOX 158
HARTLAND, MI 48353-0158
800-931-3711
www.ucscollections.com

TYR001
TYRONE TOWNSHIP
Attn: MARIAN KRAUSE
8420 RUNYAN LAKE RD

FENTON, MI 48430

Closed Report

Accounts Closed From 5/1/2021 Thru 5/31/2021

RECEIVED
JUN 09 2021

Reference #	Close Reason	Account Name	Assign Date	Closed Date	Amount Cancelled
15244	UNCOLLECTIBLE	PETERSON,DYLAN WAYNE	08/30/16	05/22/21	1,541.93
Totals	1				



UNFINISHED BUSINESS #1

Discussion of historic town hall.

No documents attached.

NEW BUSINESS #1

Approval to rent out township hall post COVID

No documents attached.