

**REGULAR MEETING**

**August 5, 2021**

**6:30 P.M.**

---

**PITTSFIELD TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

---

**Members Present:** Matthew Payne, George Ralph, Roland Kibler, Ann Harris, Stanley Young, Deborah Williams

**Members Absent:** Yameen Jaffer

**Others Present:** Jeff Katzen, Glen Soerens, Alexandra Schrader, Andrew Gibbs, Ben Gould, Bob Gibbs, Christina Lirones, Donald Johnson, Elizabeth, Jerry, Katy Adams, Ellen Adams, Markus Mobius, Nancy Standish, Patty Baird, Roger Clark, Brandon Smith, Mariah Fink, Township Attorney, Benjamin Carlisle, Township Planning Consultant, Haley Feeman, Recording Clerk

**1.0 Call Meeting to Order at 6:30 p.m. / Determination of a Quorum**

Chairperson Payne called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. A quorum was present.

**2.0 Pledge of Allegiance**

Chairperson Payne led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**3.0 Approval of Agenda**

**Motion by Commissioner Williams, supported by Commissioner Young to move 8.1 ahead of 6.1 and approve the agenda.**

**MOTION CARRIED**

**4.0 Approval of Prior Minutes**

**4.1 Regular Minutes of July 15, 2021**

**Motion by Commissioner Williams, supported by Commissioner Harris to approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of July 15, 2021.**

**MOTION CARRIED**

**5.0 Public Comment I**

None

Item 8.1 of New Business to move ahead of Item 6.1 of the Public Hearing

**8.1 Arbor Farms PUD Amendment**  
Public Hearing

West of the existing Rolling Meadows subdivision – east side of Platt / south of U.S. 12 – Michigan Avenue.

Mr. Benjamin Carlisle, Township Planning Consultant, presented the PUD Amendment for Arbor Farms. The applicant has filed for the amendment to amend the allowable lot coverage. This is a two-phase development. Phase 1 has been done and completed the final site plan was approved with a total lot coverage of 22.59%. The applicant has interpreted this as an average which allowed some of the individual lots to exceed 22.59%. As long as a total lot coverage for the entire development did not exceed 22.59%. However, in the zoning ordinance lot coverage is defined as depart or percent of the lot occupied by buildings or structures including accessory buildings or structures. We have always interpreted and always applied lot coverage on an individual basis. Thus, we interpreted and applied that no individual lot shall be over 22.59%. It came to our attention recently that there were lots that were granted building permits that did exceed the 22.59% coverage. And once the Township discovered that, there was a stop issuance of any more permits. 23 of the 44 home sites have chosen with plans that the coverage is 22.59% or under. However, there have been approximate 21 home sites that were issued permits that are over that 22.59% coverage. We have concluded in consultation with the Township Attorney that any existing home sites that were permitted and are under construction or completed will remain as is and do not require any demolition or modification. However, that does leave approximately 14 home sites that have yet to have permits issued and the applicant is seeking an amendment to increase the lot coverage for these lots from 22% to up to 40%.

Jeff Katzen, Applicant wanted to ask the Planning Commission to please consider granting this amendment for the remining 14 lots.

## **6.0 Public Hearing**

### **6.1 Arbor Farms PUD Amendment**

Public Hearing

West of the existing Rolling Meadows subdivision – east side of Platt / south of U.S. 12 – Michigan Avenue.

Christina Lirones, 151 E. Textile Road voiced her concerns about the Building Department issuing permits and the disconnect with the Planning Commission and the Building Department. Ms. Lirones stated she was also concerned on who is monitoring the new development sites. She also mentioned that she is against this PUD Amendment.

**Motion by Commissioner Ralph, supported by Commissioner Young to close the public hearing.**

Discussion was held on:

- Original Approved Lot Coverage by the applicant
- Average lot coverage created by the Engineer for Arbor Farms
- Other developments Arbor Farms has constructed and if lot coverage averages were used for those developments
- What style of homes in the development that exceeds the 22%

**Motion by Commissioner Williams, supported by Commissioner Harris to recommend denial of proposed amendment.**

**ROLL CALL**

**YES: HARRIS, WILLIAMS, YOUNG, KIBLER, RALPH, PAYNE**  
**NO: None**  
**ABSENT: JAFFER**  
**ABSTAIN: None**

**MOTION CARRIED**

**7.0 Old Business**

**7.1 ZOA 21-215 Marihuana Zoning Ordinance**

Consideration and Discussion

Mr. Carlisle, Township Planning Consultant stated that the last Planning Commission meeting the Commission directed staff to prepare a resolution to recommend the language to the township board for consideration.

Discussion was held on:

- No competitive bid was necessary
- No buffer was necessary for residential areas

**Motion by Commissioner Williams, supported by Commissioner Young, to approve the Resolution for ZOA 21-215 Marihuana Zoning.**

**ROLL CALL**

**YES: KIBLER, PAYNE, WILLIAMS, HARRIS, YOUNG, RALPH**  
**NO: None**  
**ABSENT: JAFFER**  
**ABSTAIN: None**

## **MOTION CARRIED**

### **7.2 Sutherland Farms** Submitted for PUD and Site Plan 6464 S. State (L-12-28-200-005 and 008)

Mr. Benjamin Carlisle, Township Planning Consultant, stated that the applicant is seeking a PUD that includes a mixed housing option with a small retail component. We do note that there are portions of the site having wetlands and woodlands on the northern half the site. The applicant is proposing to save all those woodlands and save most of the regulated wetlands. There is a small house located at the south east corner of the site that will be removed as part of the development. The applicant is going through the PUD process to permit this higher density mixed use development that provides a variety of housing types. The applicant is requesting to seek some deviations from the underlying zoning requirements, and some flexibility to create a more cohesive design project. The development itself will include six different types of residential products. The development is a total of 199 residential units. It includes 40 townhomes, 19 carriage homes, 24 cottage homes 106 lots and five duplex structures which total 10 dwelling units total. In addition, 4500 or so square feet of commercial space is also proposed. The applicant is seeking deviations on lot coverage, frontage setbacks and impervious service ratios for the cottage homes. They are seeking a deviation for a pervious surface ratio for the duplex units which are located in pink here. They're seeking deviation from setback, impervious surface and building heights for the townhome carriage and lot buildings. They are seeking a deviation for parking reduction, as well as parking lot width space reduction. They're seeking a waiver from a loading space requirement. The applicant was trying to match up single family to single family adjacent. However, they are seeking deviations for lot coverage, frontage setbacks, law area and impervious service ratio.

Discussion was held on:

- Parking requirements
- Block 1, 2 & 3 maximum square footage
- Setbacks on Cottages and Duplexes
- Porches on Cottages and Duplexes
- 15-foot architectural setbacks on Cottages and Duplexes
- EVE Charging Stations
- Loading area for Commercial
- Place of Worship in the development
- Bicycle parking

**Motion by Commissioner Williams, supported by Commissioner Harris to direct staff to draft the necessary Resolution of Approval with the following conditions:**

1. Development shall meet all parking requirements
2. Block 1 and 3 shall have a maximum house size of 2800 square feet.
3. Block 2 shall have a maximum house size of 2000 square feet.
4. 10ft setbacks permitted on Cottages and Duplexes provided no building foundation, porches, or steps encroach outside of the approved building envelope. Front of homes shall have a 15-foot side separation through the use of architectural step backs.
5. Applicant shall explore inclusion of EV Charging Stations
6. Loading Area for Commercial is sufficient as shown on the plans
7. Southern most non-residential building shall be office or lower intensity (from a parking requirements) use.
8. No place of worship shall be permitted in development unless plan is amended showing parking and access is adequate as proven by a parking and traffic study.
9. Applicant shall receive wetland permit as part of the final site plan
10. Applicant shall provide payment in lieu of providing sidewalks.
11. Applicant shall label bicycle parking.

**ROLL CALL**

**YES: HARRIS, WILLIAMS, YOUNG, KIBLER, RALPH, PAYNE**  
**NO: None**  
**ABSENT: JAFFER**  
**ABSTAIN: None**

**MOTION CARRIED**

**8.0 New Business**

**8.1 Arbor Farms PUD Amendment**

Public Hearing

West of the existing Rolling Meadows subdivision – east side of Platt / south of U.S. 12 – Michigan Avenue.

Item 8.1 of New Business moved ahead of Item 6.1 of the Public Hearing

**9.0 Planner's Report**

Mr. Benjamin Carlisle Township Planning Consultant wanted to mention that the Township is giving each commission/board the determination if they want to come back in person starting in September.

The Planning Commission made an unanimous vote to wait and see how things go the next couple months and stay via zoom at least until the end of September.

#### **10.0 Chairperson's Report**

None

#### **11.0 Commissioner's Report**

Mr. George Ralph wanted to mention that he agrees with the issue that Ms. Christina Lirones brought up in the Public Comment I.

#### **12.0 Public Comment II**

Christina Lirones, 151 E Textile Road wanted to ask Mr. Benjamin Carlisle about the Master Plan and mention that the Sutherland Farms does not comply with the existing Master Plan and she is against the motion.

Mr. Benjamin Carlisle stated that the Supervisors Office has put it on hold for now. It has not been released to the public. Mr. Carlisle also mentioned that he recommends that it should come back to the Planning Commission before it goes to the Township Board.

#### **13.0 Adjournment**

**Motion by Commissioner Harris seconded by Commissioner Ralph to adjourn the meeting.**

Chairperson Payne adjourned the meeting at 8:48p.m.

---

s/Deborah Williams, Secretary

August 19, 2021

**Please Note: This meeting is being recorded**

*This notice is posted in compliance with PA 267 of 1976 (as amended) Open Meetings Act, MCL 125.3103 and 125.3502 and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Individuals with disabilities requiring auxiliary aids or services should contact the Pittsfield Charter Township Clerk's Office 3 business days prior to the meeting. The Clerk's Office can be reached at 734-822-3120 or via email [clerk@pittsfield-mi.gov](mailto:clerk@pittsfield-mi.gov).*

**From:** [Haley Feeman](#)  
**To:** [Haley Feeman](#)  
**Subject:** FW: ZOA 21-217  
**Date:** Thursday, August 5, 2021 10:55:00 AM

---

**From:** Township Zoning Email  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 3, 2021 3:20 PM  
**To:** Township Planner <carlisleb@pittsfield-mi.gov>; Township Planner 2 <planning2@pittsfield-mi.gov>  
**Cc:** Haley Feeman <FeemanH@pittsfield-mi.gov>  
**Subject:** Fw: ZOA 21-217

---

**From:** Skip Spiller <[doctorspiller@yahoo.com](mailto:doctorspiller@yahoo.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 3, 2021 11:24 AM  
**To:** Township Zoning Email  
**Subject:** ZOA 21-217

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

To the Pittsfield Township Planning Commission:

We urge the Commission to reject the proposed major amendment to the existing Rolling Meadows 4 Planned Unit Development, Arbor Farms Phase 2.

We believe that the proposal to increase the footprint of each house in the development will detract from both the value of the homes to be built in Arbor Farms Phase 2 and our property value as residents of Rosewood Village.

The houses in the already existing Arbor Farms development near our condo development are extremely close to one another, so close that the development looks as if it is in an older city neighborhood rather than in spacious Pittsfield Township.

If the Commission approves the proposed footprint (a house that occupies 40% of an already small lot rather than the approved 22.59%), the Commission will have enabled the builder to repeat the unattractive and, we fear, the financially detrimental effects that already exist in Arbor Farms Phase 1.

Sincerely,

Leroy J. Spiller  
Leslie S. Spiller  
3194 Primrose Lane  
Pittsfield Township