

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 **OLD BUSINESS #1: Animal Units (Continued):**
412

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

416
417 *The item was closed.*

418
419 **NEW BUSINESS #1: Agri-Business Special Land Use Standards:**

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

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

432
433 *The item was closed.*

434
435 **CALL TO THE PUBLIC:**

436
437 Chairman Stickel asked if there were any public questions or comments. None were received.

438
439 *The item was closed.*

440
441 **MISCELLANIOUS BUSINESS #1: Next Workshop Meeting:**

442
443 A Workshop meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, January 20, 2021, beginning at 6:00 pm.

444
445 *The item was closed.*

446
447 *The meeting was adjourned at 8:37 pm by Chairman Stickel.*