

1 **TYRONE TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION**  
2 **REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**  
3 **June 9, 2020 7:00 p.m.**  
4 **Meeting Held Via Zoom Video Conferencing**  
5  
6

7 **PRESENT:** Mark Meisel, Dave Wardin, Kurt Schulze, Rich Erickson, and Perry Green  
8

9 **ABSENT:** Bill Wood and Dan Stickel  
10

11 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Tyrone Township Planner Greg Elliott  
12

13 **CALL TO ORDER (7:02 pm):** The meeting was called to order by Chairman Mark Meisel.  
14

15 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE (7:02 pm):**  
16

17 **CALL TO THE PUBLIC (7:03 pm):**  
18

19 No public comments or questions were received.  
20

21 **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA (7:03 pm):**  
22

23 Kurt Schulze made a motion to approve the agenda as presented. Dave Wardin supported the  
24 motion. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.  
25

26 **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES (7:03 pm):**  
27

28 **1. February 11, 2020 Regular Meeting:**  
29

30 Minor revisions to the draft minutes were made for clarification/spelling/grammar. Dave Wardin  
31 made a motion to approve the 02/11/2020 regular meeting minutes as amended. Rich Erickson  
32 supported the motion. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.  
33

34 **2. April 14, 2020 Regular Meeting:**  
35

36 Minor revisions to the draft minutes were made for clarification/spelling/grammar. Dave Wardin  
37 made a motion to approve the 04/14/2020 regular meeting minutes as amended. Kurt Schulze  
38 supported the motion. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.  
39

40 **3. May 12, 2020 Regular Meeting:**  
41

42 Minor revisions to the draft minutes were made for clarification/spelling/grammar. Dave Wardin  
43 made a motion to approve the 05/12/2020 regular meeting minutes as presented. Perry Green  
44 supported the motion. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.  
45  
46

47 **OLD BUSINESS #1 (7:14 pm): Betley Sight Line Determination:**

48  
49 Chairman Meisel introduced the topic with a summary of where the Planning Commission had  
50 left off in review of the Betley sight line determination request. He indicated that following the  
51 May 20<sup>th</sup>, 2020 Planning Commission meeting, there was a discussion amongst Township staff  
52 in an effort to determine viable options for arriving at a sight line determination. The primary  
53 focus of the discussion was to determine exactly what additional details the Planning  
54 Commission would need in order to arrive at a decision on the request. He continued, stating  
55 that Township staff agreed to contact the applicant and request to open up discussion between  
56 the applicant's designer/representative and the Planning Commission in an effort to find common  
57 ground in terms of the specific details needed to arrive at a sight line determination. He stated  
58 that there have been a number of delays resulting in the direct discussion not taking place prior to  
59 this meeting, however, additional documents had been preemptively provided to the Planning  
60 Commission by the designer/representative. Chairman Meisel suggested that the Planning  
61 Commission go through the recently submitted documents and review. He indicated that he  
62 would be recusing himself from discussion of the topic per the request of the applicants. He  
63 asked the Planning Commission who would like to take the lead on discussion of the topic.  
64

65 Dave Wardin requested that Chairman Meisel bring up one of the recently submitted documents  
66 on the shared screen for discussion. The document included lot dimensions and topographical  
67 data on the subject property ("LOT 4") and both immediately adjacent properties (north  
68 side/"LOT 5" and south side/"LOT 3"). The drawing also included the locations of all existing  
69 and proposed structures. Dave Wardin asked if the applicant's designer/representative was  
70 present at the meeting. Neil Webb (designer/representative for the applicants), indicated that he  
71 was present and available to answer questions. Dave Wardin asked Neil Webb what the red line  
72 on the drawing represented near the bottom of the drawing. Neil Webb indicated that the red line  
73 represents the average frontage measured from the corner of the detached accessory structure  
74 located in the year (lake side) of the property immediately adjacent to the subject property (on  
75 the north side/"LOT 5") to the corner of the retaining wall located on the property located  
76 immediately adjacent to the subject property (on the south side/"LOT 3"). Dave Wardin asked  
77 Greg Elliott if the measurement shown on the drawing is consistent with the method of  
78 measurement prescribed by the Zoning Ordinance in regards to setback averaging. Greg Elliott  
79 stated that the detached accessory structure on LOT 5 should be included in the measurement,  
80 but the retaining wall on LOT 3 may not. Neil Webb stated that he would view the retaining  
81 wall as a part of the principle structure's overall footprint if it is considered to be structural  
82 (necessary to prevent the dwelling from shifting/tilting/sinking/becoming destroyed). Greg  
83 Elliott indicated that he believes his viewpoint is in conflict with the Zoning Ordinance  
84 standards, but he would look through the Zoning Ordinance definitions to confirm. Dave Wardin  
85 stated that, if measuring setback distances from the rear sides of the principle structures  
86 (dwellings) located on LOT 3 and LOT 5, there would definitely be a difference of more than  
87 forty feet (40') and, therefore, Footnote X (Zoning Ordinance, Section 20.02.X) would apply.  
88 Neil Webb asked Dave Wardin if the Planning Commission had determined whether or not they  
89 believe a cove to be present at the subject property. Dave Wardin stated that, in his opinion,  
90 based on the definition of a cove, he believes that a cove is present. Dave Wardin asked the  
91 Planning Commission if they had any additional thoughts to add regarding whether or not a cove  
92 exists. Rich Erickson stated that he believes a cove does exist, based on the definition of a cove.

93 Neil Webb indicated that he also believes a cove exists. He stated that, from a sight line  
94 perspective, elevations should be taken into account. He noted that the finished floor elevation  
95 (FFE) of the dwelling on LOT 5 is at approximately nine-hundred and twenty-five and one-half  
96 feet (925.5'), the FFE [at the basement level] of the dwelling on LOT 3 is at approximately nine-  
97 hundred and twenty-one feet (921'). He continued, stating that Mark and Molly Betley's  
98 proposed dwelling would be located at an elevation [at the 1<sup>st</sup> level] approximately fifteen feet  
99 (15') lower than the FFE of LOT 3 and approximately ten feet (10') lower than the FFE of LOT  
100 5. He stated that the proposed dwelling on the subject property is a single-story ranch-style with  
101 a 6/12 roof pitch (essentially 45-degree angle roof) and a basement level walkout. He continued,  
102 stating that, from a line-of-sight standpoint, the applicants have attempted to reduce the impact to  
103 adjacent views by lowering the FFE as much as possible. He added that building into the  
104 hill/existing grade also helps to reduce costs association with construction as well as benefitting  
105 the overall flow of the terrain. Greg Elliott stated that he had finished looking through the  
106 Zoning Ordinance definitions pertaining to accessory buildings and structures as they would  
107 relate to Footnote X. He stated that Footnote X references accessory buildings for measurement  
108 purposes and not accessory structures. He stated that the definition of building is "An  
109 independent structure, either temporary or permanent, having a roof supported by columns or  
110 walls", which means the retaining wall on LOT 3 would not be relevant in regards to  
111 measurements pertaining to sight lines. Dave Wardin stated that the red line on the drawing  
112 would need to be adjusted, specifically on LOT 3. He asked Greg Elliott to confirm that the  
113 point where the red line connects to the detached garage on LOT 5 was in the appropriate  
114 location. Greg Elliott confirmed. Neil Webb asked the Planning Commission to confirm that  
115 there is an exception to the method of measurement being described if a cove exists at the subject  
116 property, in accordance with Footnote X. Dave Wardin confirmed, adding clarification that it  
117 would be a *possible* exception. Neil Webb stated that, from a fairness standpoint, if the proposed  
118 dwelling would be located at an elevation equal to that of the dwellings on LOT 3 and LOT 5, he  
119 could see there being an issue in regards to sight lines, however, at the proposed elevation, there  
120 would be a minimal impact to adjacent sight lines. He added that there were previously two (2)  
121 mature walnut trees located on the subject property which historically obstructed the views of the  
122 lake from both the subject property and the adjacent properties. He stated that there was a  
123 photograph submitted to the Planning Commission which depicted the aforementioned trees.  
124 Dave Wardin confirmed that he had seen the photograph.

125  
126 Dave Wardin stated that he personally likes the details shown on the latest documents provided  
127 but he has not had sufficient time to review all of the information because it was just received the  
128 night prior to the meeting. He asked Neil Webb if he was in the process of/planning on  
129 preparing a grading plan and possibly generating elevation drawings based on the topographical  
130 data and previously submitted renderings to better demonstrate how the roofline of the proposed  
131 structure would coincide with the adjacent sight lines. Neil Webb stated that the new  
132 topographical data confirms the accuracy of the elevation drawings and renderings originally  
133 submitted within a minimal margin of error. He stated that the slope of the hill, based on the  
134 topographical data, is consistent with the original elevation drawings and renderings. He stated  
135 that one element of the design that has changed since the topographical data was incorporated, is  
136 that they were able to lower the FFE of the proposed dwelling by approximately two feet (2')  
137 from where it was initially depicted in earlier drawings. Dave Wardin indicated that the  
138 standards for the temporary dwelling during construction application, which is directly related to

139 the sight line evaluation, will require a plot plan and grading plan. He suggested, for clarity  
140 purposes, that actual elevations (numbers, as depicted on the topographical drawing) be added to  
141 elevation drawings and plot plan. Neil Webb confirmed that he would be able to do that. Dave  
142 Wardin added that when he is making the revisions to the drawings, he should also make the  
143 adjustment to the red line on the topographical drawing in regards to its location on LOT 3, as  
144 previously discussed (change the point location from the retaining wall to the corner of the  
145 foundation of the dwelling). He stated that once the requested revisions are made the Planning  
146 Commission will be able to better evaluate the sight lines. He indicated that the sooner he is able  
147 to provide the revised drawings the better. Neil Webb asked that an additional document he had  
148 recently provided be brought up on the shared screen. Chairman Meisel located the requested  
149 document and brought it up on the screen. The document depicted an aerial view of Runyan  
150 Lake with approximate proposed sight lines for the proposed dwelling on the subject property.  
151 Neil Webb described the image. He stated that, the image shows projected sight lines of the  
152 subject area extending across the full extent of the lake, based on the approximate average  
153 setback line between the retaining wall located on LOT 3 and the detached garage on LOT 5  
154 (depicted as the red line on the topographical drawing which was previously shown on the shared  
155 screen). He stated that the design of the proposed home would not be feasible if the depicted  
156 average setback line is altered to connect to the corner of the foundation of the existing dwelling  
157 on LOT 3 as opposed to the existing retaining wall located on LOT 3. Dave Wardin stated that  
158 he does not believe that the proposed dwelling would necessarily be required to be positioned  
159 entirely in front of [road side of the subject property] the approximate average setback line  
160 because the presence of a cove and the variation in adjacent setbacks greater than 40' allow the  
161 Planning Commission to apply the exception to setback averaging per Footnote X in the Zoning  
162 Ordinance. Greg Elliott confirmed. Dave Wardin stated that, in this particular instance, if the  
163 Planning Commission deems a location beyond the approximate average setback line to be  
164 appropriate, they could potentially allow the dwelling to be positioned beyond the approximate  
165 average setback line [towards the lake side of the subject property]. He continued, stating that in  
166 order for the Planning Commission to make an informed decision, he believes the approximate  
167 average setback line on the drawings should be corrected per the measurement method  
168 prescribed in the Zoning Ordinance. Neil Webb indicated that he would revise the drawings to  
169 correct the approximate average setback line. Dave Wardin summarized his comments. He  
170 indicated that he would like to see revised elevation drawings/renderings incorporating the FFE  
171 figures as depicted on the topographical drawing and a grading plan.

172  
173 Molly Betley stated that she would like to ask a question of the Planning Commission. She  
174 asked if the Planning Commission will be able to arrive at a sight line determination at the June  
175 24, 2020 meeting if all of the requested revisions are made and additional requested information  
176 is submitted. Dave Wardin indicated that, barring unforeseen circumstances, based on his  
177 interpretation, he believes the Planning Commission could arrive at a determination at the  
178 06/24/2020 meeting. Chairman Meisel asked the Planning Commission if anyone disagreed or  
179 had any comments. Perry Green and Kurt Schulze agreed with Dave Wardin's statement. Dave  
180 Wardin indicated that the sooner the requested information is received, the better. Neil Webb  
181 stated that his goal is to have the requested information submitted prior to the end of the current  
182 week. Chairman Meisel asked if there were any additional questions for the applicants. Molly  
183 Betley asked the Planning Commission to confirm that it would be possible to also include the  
184 temporary dwelling during construction application on the 06/24/2020 meeting agenda.

185 Chairman Meisel stated that the Planning Commission has been working with Township staff in  
186 an effort to make that happen. He stated that it should be possible assuming that they will have a  
187 quorum at that meeting. Chairman Meisel asked if there were any additional questions or  
188 comments. Dave Wardin asked if a motion is required at the present time. Chairman Meisel  
189 advised that, technically, a motion is not required because no action is being taken at the present  
190 time. He asked Neil Webb if he fully understood the request for revisions and additional  
191 information. Neil Webb confirmed. Dave Wardin suggested bringing up the Zoning Ordinance  
192 standards pertaining to plot plan requirements for temporary dwelling during construction  
193 applications (Section 21.31.A.3.a). Chairman Meisel brought up the Section on the shared  
194 screen. Section 21.31.A.3.a indicates that a plot plan shall be required containing the  
195 information specified in Section 21.25.E. Chairman Meisel brought up Section 21.25.E on the  
196 shared screen. Dave Wardin asked Neil Webb if he had the information required for the plot  
197 plan. Neil Webb stated that he believes the information was provided to him, but he wrote down  
198 the section numbers to verify that everything matches up with the information he has. Chairman  
199 Meisel offered to email Neil Webb the information as well if he would like. Neil Webb  
200 indicated that he would like him to email the information. Chairman Meisel indicated that he  
201 would send the information after the meeting. Neil Webb thanked Chairman Meisel.

202  
203 Chairman Meisel asked the Planning Commission if there were any additional questions or  
204 comments. None were received.

205  
206 *The item was closed at 7:42 pm.*

207  
208 **OLD BUSINESS #2 (7:42 pm): Article 27: Sign Amendments:**

209  
210 Chairman Meisel indicated that he included the topic on the agenda to evaluate what else need to  
211 be done and to see if there was anything the Planning Commission could help Greg Elliott with  
212 regarding the draft sign amendments. He asked Greg Elliott for his input. Greg Elliott asked if  
213 he could redefine the past and send the latest version of the draft to him. Chairman Meisel  
214 brought up the latest draft of the proposed amendments. He stated that the draft was started by  
215 Greg Elliott's predecessor and it appears to be incomplete. He pointed out several areas of the  
216 draft document where there were deficiencies that should be addressed. He continued going  
217 through the document, making notes of corrections and revisions that should be made. Greg  
218 Elliott stated that the draft, in its current form, is not in an ordinance format, which should be  
219 changed as well. Chairman Meisel suggested that Greg Elliott communicate with Brian Keesey  
220 (original author of the draft amendments) to see if he has any additional documents that could aid  
221 him in making revisions to the document.

222  
223 Chairman Meisel asked the Planning Commission if they had any questions or comments. Kurt  
224 Schulze indicated that he believes the proposed strategy to make revisions to the document to be  
225 a good plan. Chairman Meisel suggested to Kurt Schulze that he should communicate to the  
226 Board that, moving forward, it would be beneficial to the Planning Commission if someone  
227 could take detailed notes on comments and questions from the Board regarding proposed  
228 ordinance amendments. Kurt Schulze agreed.

229  
230 *The item was closed at 7:51 pm.*

231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275

**OLD BUSINESS #3 (7:51 pm): Swimming Pool Covers:**

Chairman Meisel summarized the previous discussion of the topic. He indicated that Kurt Schulze was going to ask the Board of Trustees for their thoughts and opinions on the current pool enclosure requirements and potential amendments. He asked Kurt Schulze to relay the information he had received from the Board.

Kurt Schulze stated that a concern that the Board expressed is regarding potential liability in regards to regulating pool covers and enclosures. He stated that he will be addressing some of the questions to Greg Elliott to get his perspective from a planning and legal point of view. He asked if the ordinance is amended to permit ASTM-compliant pool covers (recognized as an acceptable alternative to fenced enclosures by the Michigan Building Code) in lieu of fenced enclosures with a self-latching gate (as currently required for all swimming pools by the Zoning Ordinance), whether or not it would be the Township’s responsibility to inspect and verify that of pool covers are replaced/demonstrated to be in good working order upon/prior to the end of the anticipated life expectancy timeframe of each pool cover permitted by the Township. Kurt Schulze asked if someone were to be injured/killed due to the failure of a pool cover permitted by the Township, if there would be potential for the Township to become a party in any type of litigation. Greg Elliott stated that becoming a potential party in litigation is different than ultimate liability. He stated that municipalities have broad immunity as it relates to court liability. He stated that the nature of governmental potential liability is general immunity, however, there are a number of exceptions as well. He provided an example of one of the exceptions; gross negligence. He explained that municipalities are immune from litigation pertaining to negligence, unless it is considered by the court to be gross negligence. He stated that being said, it is not the same as the question as to whether or not the Township could be sued. He stated that, if a person gets hurt and the township is named as a responsible party, it is then the duty of the Township and their insurance company to defend themselves. He stated that the word “undertaking” is of importance in the discussion. He explained that a municipality may not otherwise have a responsibility/duty pertaining to a specific subject, however, if the municipality chooses to undertake a task, they may create a responsibility/duty for themselves. He continued, stating that, in terms of the Township’s potential to be considered liable, it is less likely if they choose not to undertake a task at all. He indicated that the Township currently does not have liability pertaining to pool enclosures since, under the current Zoning Ordinance standards, the Livingston County Building Department (LCBD) is the responsible party for issuing building permits and performing inspections. He continued, stating that, if the Township chooses to undertake additional regulations above and beyond what is currently required by the Building Code, it would be much more likely that the Township could be sued in the event of an accident. He stated that the actual liability would depend on whether or not the situation can be considered an exception to general immunity. He stated that, if the Township chooses to allow pool covers in lieu of fenced enclosures through a special land use process (above and beyond the minimum standards prescribed by the Building Code), and the Township fails to perform inspections following the end of the anticipated life expectancy timeframe of an approved pool cover, the Township would become a potential target for lawsuits.

276 Kurt Schulze asked Greg Elliott if the Township could potentially adopt regulations permitting  
277 pool covers using a method that does not require a special land use permit and additional  
278 administrative responsibilities (such as mandatory inspections following the end of the  
279 anticipated life expectancy timeframe of an approved pool cover). He stated that the Board's  
280 current position is that they would prefer not to take on additional administrative responsibilities  
281 that are unnecessary. He also indicated that the Board has concerns about the potential issues  
282 with keeping track of the anticipated life expectancy timeframe of all approved pool covers since  
283 those timeframes are generally around five (5) to seven (7) years. Chairman Meisel stated that,  
284 in terms of monitoring special land uses, the Township currently has a number of special land  
285 use permits that will expire and/or require periodic review. He stated that it is possible for the  
286 Township to keep track of such special land uses, however, he understands that it would likely  
287 increase the volume of administrative duties Township staff would be responsible for. He stated  
288 that, if the Board has concerns about the way special land uses are managed and administered, it  
289 would appear that there is a bigger administrative issue regardless of the topic. Greg Elliott  
290 stated that, if the Township would like to allow pool covers in lieu of fenced enclosures, they  
291 wouldn't need to do anything except remove any language that prohibits the use of pool covers  
292 from the Zoning Ordinance because the Building Code already allows the use. He stated that, if  
293 the Township chooses to be silent on the topic of pool enclosure requirements, ASTM-compliant  
294 pool covers and/or a fenced enclosure with a self-latching gate would automatically be required  
295 per the Building Code. He continued, stating that if the Township chooses to undertake  
296 additional regulations restricting the use of pool covers, they would then create a duty for  
297 themselves to ensure compliance with said regulations.

298  
299 Chairman Meisel asked Greg Elliott if he could check with his peers/coworkers to get an idea of  
300 how other municipalities are addressing the topic of pool covers. Greg Elliott agreed to request  
301 input. Chairman Meisel stated that he would like to provide all necessary information to the  
302 Township Board including how other municipalities regulate and potential liability so that they  
303 can make an informed decision. He stated that it would be a good idea to get an opinion from  
304 the Township attorney on the topic. Greg Elliott recommended that the Township consult with  
305 their insurance company as well. The Planning Commission briefly recapped the discussion to  
306 determine the appropriate next steps that should be taken.

307  
308 Greg Elliott asked for confirmation that the Zoning Ordinance currently requires a fenced  
309 enclosure for swimming pools. Chairman Meisel confirmed. Greg Elliott stated that, if the  
310 Township chooses to do nothing, fenced enclosures will still be required for all swimming pools.  
311 He stated that, if the Township chooses to allow approved safety covers in lieu of fenced  
312 enclosures, they would need to remove the requirement for fenced enclosures from the Zoning  
313 Ordinance. He stated that, if a person feels that allowing only pool safety covers without  
314 requiring a fenced enclosure is a bad idea in general and an accident were to occur in a situation  
315 where a pool cover was permitted without a fence, they could potentially target the Township for  
316 removing the fenced enclosure requirement. Perry Green stated that, in his opinion, he believes  
317 that they should either leave the Zoning Ordinance requirements as they are written or remove  
318 the enclosure requirements altogether. He stated that he believes the vast majority of people with  
319 pools would likely choose to have both a fence and a safety cover over a safety cover by itself as  
320 a means of protecting themselves and others while also reducing the potential for liability. A

321 brief discussion amongst the Planning Commission followed regarding zoning compliance and  
322 building compliance permitting processes.

323  
324 Chairman Meisel summarized the discussion and proposed next steps in terms of gathering  
325 additional information to present to the Township Board. He asked if there were any questions  
326 or comments. None were received.

327  
328 *The item was closed at 8:17 pm.*

329  
330 **OLD BUSINESS #4 (8:17 pm): Open Space Regulations Review and Consolidation:**

331  
332 Chairman Meisel stated that he had a thought that may or may not warrant additional discussion.  
333 He suggested that it may be a good idea to take a look at and possibly suggest amendments to the  
334 Cluster Development Option (CDO) requirements in the Zoning Ordinance prior to/concurrent  
335 with continued discussion on the current open space regulations. He asked the Planning  
336 Commission for input. Dave Wardin stated that he does not want the topic to turn into a  
337 situation similar to the proposed sign amendments, where the drafts are almost ready to go but  
338 are then put off to the side so that the Planning Commission could focus on additional  
339 amendment drafts. Chairman Meisel stated that the thought process behind holding off on  
340 submitting the proposed sign amendments was so that the Planning Commission could attempt to  
341 complete additional draft amendments and send them over as a batch to the Township Board as  
342 opposed to submitting one at a time (making the administrative process associated with  
343 ordinance amendments more efficient). Kurt Schulze stated that one issue the Board has  
344 experienced with receiving batches of proposed amendments as opposed to receiving them  
345 individually is due to the large amount of information that needs to be reviewed at the same time.  
346 He stated that Board may prefer receiving individual amendments to allow them to better focus  
347 on each topic in greater depth than what could be accomplished if reviewed concurrently.  
348 Chairman Meisel indicated that, in the case of the latest batch of proposed amendments, the  
349 Township Board deferred them from their meeting agendas for almost a month, which arguably  
350 should have allowed for additional time to review the information. He continued, stating that,  
351 the Township Board is not required to review all amendments concurrently, even if the  
352 recommendations are sent in a batch. He indicated that, in reference to the latest batch of  
353 amendments, he would have preferred that the Board reach out to the Planning Commission with  
354 questions and comments prior to including them on a meeting agenda. Kurt Schulze agreed that  
355 the method described by Chairman Meisel could potentially result in a more efficient review by  
356 the Board during meetings.

357  
358 A brief discussion followed regarding potential methods for improving efficiencies in regards to  
359 the ordinance amendment process and communication between the Planning Commission and  
360 the Township Board. It was determined that additional discussion will be necessary.

361  
362 Chairman Meisel asked the Planning Commission if they had any questions or comments. Dave  
363 Wardin suggested to Kurt Schulze that at the next Board meeting, he should suggest that the  
364 Township publish information on the Township website and post at the Township Hall regarding  
365 the usage of fireworks including the State statutory requirements. Kurt Schulze confirmed that  
366 he would communicate that to the Board.



367 Chairman Meisel suggested working on potential amendments to Article 29 of the Zoning  
368 Ordinance (Zoning Amendments). He pulled up a draft of proposed amendments to Article 29  
369 on the shared screen for discussion, specifically Section 29.05 regarding Conditional Rezoning  
370 standards. He summarized the latest discussion on the topic and scrolled through the document,  
371 making note of each suggested revision that had been made thus far. The Planning Commission  
372 briefly discussed the suggested revisions and made several modifications to the draft document.  
373 Dave Wardin suggested possibly adding definitions for each step of the site plan review process  
374 to add clarity. Chairman Meisel continued to read through the draft document and discussion  
375 amongst the Planning Commission continued.

376  
377 Chairman Meisel asked if there were any questions or comments regarding the latest version of  
378 the draft amendments.

379  
380 *The item was closed at 8:55 pm.*

381  
382 **MISCELLANIOUS BUSINESS #1 (8:55 pm): Next Workshop Meeting:**

383  
384 Chairman Meisel reminded the Planning Commission that they have scheduled the next  
385 workshop meeting for June 24, 2020 at 6:00 pm and converted it to a regular meeting to discuss  
386 an open application and sight line determination request and hold a public hearing for a Special  
387 Land Use permit application. He asked for the Planning Commission's opinions on whether or  
388 not they believed a Planner review of the Special Land Use application would be necessary.  
389 Dave Wardin indicated that he believed it would be a good idea. The Planning Commission  
390 briefly discussed the proposed order of agenda items for the 06/24/2020 meeting.

391  
392 *The item was closed at 8:59 pm.*

393  
394 **CALL TO THE PUBLIC (8:59 pm):**

395  
396 Chairman Meisel asked if there were any members of the public present who had any questions  
397 or comments for the Planning Commission. None were received.

398  
399 Kurt Schulze asked Chairman Meisel if he has any information regarding when it may be  
400 possible to resume in-person meetings instead of holding them exclusively via Zoom. Chairman  
401 Meisel indicated that he has not been involved in discussions with Township staff on the topic,  
402 with the exception of a question regarding the next regular Zoning Board of Appeals meeting.  
403 He stated that the Township needs to consider a number of factors in making a decision inclusive  
404 of limitations imposed through Governor-issued executive orders. Kurt Schulze stated that he  
405 believes the next regular Board meeting will be held at the Township Hall. A brief discussion  
406 regarding the COVID-19 pandemic as well as the resulting restrictions and guidelines ensued.

407  
408 *The meeting was adjourned at 9:07 pm.*