**Solon Township Planning Commission**

Solon Township Hall

9191 S. Kasson St.,

Cedar, MI 49621

**AGENDA**

Regular Meeting Agenda

Tuesday, July 30, 2024,

6:00 P.M

**MEMBERS**

Steve Morgan – Chairman – Term expires 12/31/24

Todd Yeomans – Vice Chair / ZBA Rep 12/31/24

Steve Yoder – Member / Twp Board Rep 11/17/24

Meg Paxton – Member 12/31/25

Samantha Vandervlucht – Member 12/31/25

1. Call Meeting to Order **by Chairman Morgan at 6:30 p.m.**
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Roll Call: **Yeomans, Morgan, Yoder and Paxton.**

**Absent:** **Vandervlucht** - excused

1. Approval of Agenda: **Moved by Yeomans to approve the agenda as presented, seconded by Paxton.**

**Passed 4-0**

1. Approval of Meeting Minutes; July 2, 2024, Regular Meeting Minutes: **Moved by Yoder to amend minutes of July 2, 2024, as Yeomans was an excused absence, seconded by Paxton.**

**Passed 4-0**

1. Conflicts of Interest: **None**
2. Public Comment; (Limited to three minutes per person unless extended by Chairman).

**Jean Popa:** Resides on E. Popa Rd., just became aware that there are some proposed zoning changes that would allow for ½ acre PUD density increases along Popa Rd., stated that she grew up in Traverse City when Traverse was a much more peaceful place. We played ball in the streets without a worry and over time it has really grown. Goes back to where she grew up and there is car after car and housing on top of one another. Leaves work grateful to come back to Cedar. It is beautiful and peaceful here and would like it to remain that way. Popa Road is a family friendly road which people can ride bikes and walk and would like it to stay calm and peaceful. Does not want to see an increase in housing along the road. Ask that the PC reconsider the zoning in this area.

**Hanaha Popa:** Resides on E. Popa Rd., Born and was raised in Grand Traverse and Leelanau County throughout her life. Grew up on the south side of the cedar swamps and enjoyed the beauty of the area. Married a man from the Popa family and has been able to live out her dream of living on acreage on Popa Road. Enjoys raising her family in this beautiful area. Coming into a generational change where parents and grandparents are passing land off to their children. We have to decide if this land is going to parceled up into small pieces and become another suburb of Traverse City or will it be protected where people can raise families? We do need the township and the county to help us protect it so that larger developments do not come in and push out small families looking to raise their children on. We do not want to crowd out the type of lifestyle that we created in Leelanau which makes our community truly what it is. We want to keep raising families here that get their kids outside to learn to grow gardens, can vegetables, participate in 4H and get lost in the woods for hours before mom calls them in for dinner. We have to have protection of the land. Preservation now is important because we can’t go backwards once it is all parceled out. Recognizing that you may have to sacrifice some tax dollars but it is in the best interest of the residences of this area. Appreciates the PC’s time.

**Morgan:** These are proposed changes at this time. This still needs to pass through the township board and that would be a good place to voice your opinion as well.

**Judy Janosk:** Township board does not post their agenda until the day of the meeting.

**Karen Smith:** Would like to echo what they were saying and thinks more people feel this way but have not spoken up. Has been at these meetings all along with the changes made in the proposals and has not personally spoken up because she was aware that these changes are ongoing. Believes that the residents of Cedar want to protect this area. Has lived here for the past five years and appreciates what Cedar has to offer and also wants to protect what we have here. Looks at the development across the street and thinks it belongs in California not Cedar as this does not represent the style of housing in Cedar and for what Cedar has to offer. The density may be what the PC is looking for but they need to take into consideration the character of the area and what is appropriate for here.

1. Correspondence: **None**
2. Reports
3. **Township Board Representative:** Yoder at the last board meeting on July 11th, the master plan will be on the agenda for the August 15th meeting. After some discussion Corey Flaska came to the meeting and pushed the board to get this moving forward. This will not be a public hearing rather just a vote to release it to the public for review and comment. This is close to a year out from being adopted. This will help mold and shape this plan to what the residence would like to see as a final product. We will have a resolution at the next board meeting to request the Road Commission to properly maintain Roskinski Road along with a request to have a speed study conducted on this road. Part of the Road is located in Centerville Township as well so they will also have to work with Centerville Township on this issue as well as Solon Township. The board did approve $1,250.00 to be spent with Sledgehammer to provide a couple proposals on sewer systems. Sledgehammer is a new green initiative that does not require a new system rather something that they install for irrigation. The pressure tank at the township hall has been changed but there is still some sand in the lines. The well may need to be replaced. The board also approved $9,200.00 to replace the wall in the parking area with L&M which is an insured company. The board also approved $87,500.00 to renovate the township hall. The contractor for this project is Leelanau Construction. This proposal includes changing the upstairs to create office space and renovations of the restrooms along with providing the structure to be ADA compliant. There was also $3,700.00 approved for fill for the cemetery to close down roads. With the closure of these roads, it allows for additional burial sites. According to the minutes there was a Park Ordinance that was adopted back in 2008 but the ordinance has not been located as it was not attached to the minutes. Hoping that there is a copy in the boxes upstairs. This is a separate ordinance than the zoning ordinance. The Cedar Chamber of Commerce has agreed to spend $5,000.00 to repair the lights and score board at the ball diamonds. There is a joint Airport zoning board that is being established by the County that will deal with zoning for the airport within a ten-mile radius. Half of Solon Township is within this area, most of Elmwood Township and part of Bingham and multiple townships within Grand Traverse County. The County Administrator reached out to Supervisor Lautner and requested that Solon, Bingham and Elmwood nominate someone so the Board of Commissioners can pick people to serve on the Board. Solon Township nominated Christina Deeren as their representative. If picked to participate in the new Airport Zoning Board then we will be provided with updates on what is occurring.
4. **ZBA Representative:** Yeomans – Nothing to report.
5. **Zoning Administrator:** Deeren reported that she has been out looking at permit boards with active construction occurring and has found that some of these permits have expired and will inform the property owners that these LUP’s need to be updated. Still receiving calls on land divisions and the process of dividing land.
6. Old Business;
7. Review Accessory Dwelling Units – Amendments

**Paxton:** Provided corrections and comments on the draft.

**Deeren:** Will remove the section from the ordinance that was added to show what the current ordinance states.

**Yoder:** Questioned setting some acroamas in place in the beginning of the ordinance so that the continuation of the granny flat or accessory dwelling unit didn’t have to continue throughout the document which would then slightly shorten this. Also questions on why not just put the various zoning districts instead of five-acre requirements.

**Deeren:** The five-acre minimum requirement was added intentionally as some of the properties within the zoned districts are less than five acres. There are existing properties that are non-conforming to the current zoning standards and therefore this ordinance would not apply to those parcels. The five-acre minimum allows for this to be adopted in more zoned districts.

**Board discussion of minimum acreage size for ADU’s.** **The board was divided on what the minimum acreage requirements should be so they will wait until the next meeting to determine what the majority is in agreement on for the minimum acreage size. Went through the ordinance to determine what zoned districts allow for two-family dwelling units.**

**Paxton:** Asked if it was possible to get every zoned district to have an ADU.

**Deeren:** Not all districts, as the commercial and industrial districts do not

allow for additional housing which is logical as these districts are meant for business

activities. You also cannot add this to areas that already have an approved PUD

in place as the density has already been maximized. There is existing

conditions which would prevent every property within the township to be able to

build this type of additional housing.

**Yeomans:** Firm believer that if you own it, you can do what you want. Wants tiny

houses to be able to be provided in the township.

**Deeren:** Stated that the ordinance does allow for small houses to be constructed of

a minimum of 400 square feet. Deeren also stated again that the PC has done a

wonderful job of allowing for a variety of different uses to occur in the township.

Zoning does help to control growth in a responsible way.

**Yeomans:** Supports controlled growth in the community.

**Yoder:** Under item 7 – Driveways and Parking do we have to have in this Leelanau

County Road Commission and Solon Twp for permits to be obtained for driveways?

**Deeren:** Yes, because the township has a driveway permit for new driveways. This is

because we need to make sure that the grade is less than 12% for emergency

vehicles to access the properties for emergency purposes. The Road Commission is

only concerned with ingress/egress for site distances and the placement of

driveways in accordance with adjacent properties.

**Yoder:** Was not aware the township had a permit for new driveways.

**Yeomans:** Would the granny flat or ADU use the same existing driveway?

**Paxton:** It could or could not.

**Yeomans:** Why would we not require that?  
 **Paxton:** Depending on the location of where they place the granny flat or ADU it may

or may not require an additional driveway to be located on the property.

**Yeomans:** In his opinion a granny flat or ADU would be located next to the main

residence so that you can be closer to help granny.

**Paxton:** This is not something that we can instruct people that this must be within so

many feet of the primary dwelling unit.

**Morgan:** Can we stipulate that it has to be a maximum number of feet from a

primary residence?

**Deeren:** We could limit this but what happens when we have a wetland or a parcel

with multiple road frontages? People may want granny on the property but not

within so many feet of the primary dwelling. Believes that this should be open but

an isolation distance between buildings should still be maintained.

**Yeomans:** If it were closer to the primary residence then could you go off the well

and septic?

**Deeren:** If the septic isn’t large enough to have an additional structure, then a new

one would be required. We would not want a shared system.

**Yeomans:** Foresees these parcels as possibly being split in the future.

**Deeren:** Agrees that this is possible and will likely occur. The septic systems for these

will not be huge as we have capped the size to 1,000 square feet with typical one to

two bedrooms. Septic systems are based on bedroom count and not how many

bathroom facilities are within the building.

**Paxton:** Wishes this could be either/or with the septic. If the ADU is close enough

then they could share the well and septic.

**Yoder:** What would be wrong with calling these accessory dwelling units instead of

granny flats?

**Deeren:** There are two different definitions so to cover two bases that is how it was

written. Different areas refer to these differently.

**Yoder:** To shorten this can we eliminate the double verbiage.

**Deeren:** Yes, we can do that.

**Paxton:** Request to add the septic/well connection within so many feet of main

primary residence.

**Deeren:** Two hundred and fifty feet would be reasonable.

**Paxton:** If the accessory unit is less than two hundred and fifty feet from the primary

unit you may tie into the existing well/septic as long as the existing system is large

enough to handle the additional volume.

**Yoder:** Why not just state if the Health Department allows for it which would

eliminate all of that.

**Paxton:** Make this less than two hundred and fifty so if they want to share the septic

it is required that it has to be within so many feet.

**Morgan:** Aren’t all septic’s put in specifically to meet the capability of the size of the

structure?

**Yeomans:** With newer housing this is the case but with older homes this may not be

the case. The government got involved and made people install bigger tanks.

**Morgan:** If someone builds an ADU, wouldn’t they have to have an inspection done

of the existing infrastructure?

**Deeren:** More than likely if they were to add another building to the existing septic.

**Further board discussion on these being rental units and the length of time as they**

**are opposed for these being used for short term rental units which are not**

**currently an allowed use. Board wants these to be omitted from any future short-**

**term rental ordinance.**

**Morgan:** At the next meeting the first discussion should be on whether we allow

these or not. Does not support this ordinance if these become rental units.

**Tabled until next meeting.**

1. Landscape Ordinance – Review previous Amendments with changes

**Deeren:** This was restructured from the previous ordinance as discussed in the last meeting.

**Paxton:** Section 19.06 (B1)- 20% shall be greenspace with no less than 40% to the buildings. Under parking and storage number 3 – page line is off. Number 6 add commas. Do not exceed 20%. Section 19.07 under parking lot tree requirement number of parking spaces needs to be bold. Section 19.14 Enforcement – likes the cost of $100.00 per day for violation. Looking for a timeframe and remedy to be added.

**Yoder:** Section 19.04 states 30 days.

**Paxton:** Make sure timelines are consistent.

**Morgan:** Suggest 30 days to come into compliance and after which then becomes a violation.

**Yoder:** Suggested taking out caliper and just leaving tree height.

**Yeomans:** If you have an established tree then it doesn’t need to be replaced.

**Yoder:** Under Section 19.06 B4 – Mulch - wondering if we can clean up. Rubber needs to be removed as this is what is being installed. Believes rubber mulch was added to Cedar. Colored is in there because it is not organic. D. wall standards – 40 inches but we require 60 inches in other portions of the ordinance. Make sure that this matches our other requirements. Some of these – Section 19.07 K – Islands shall be at least 170 square feet in area. In L they need to be a minimum of 15 feet wide.

**Paxton:** D, E, K and L all speak to islands. Can these all be condensed into one sentence.

**Yoder:** Allow more spacing for parking and eliminate some of the additional islands. Screening requirements in 19.10 – Fence is required to be 6 feet.

**Paxton:** what would we think is appropriate?

**Yoder:** Is for every ten spaces. Could also eliminate C. Remove the last graph.

**Yeomans:** This ordinance was taken from the Harbor Springs area.

**Deeren:** Kept pictures as visuals are typically very useful for anyone using the ordinance. Will make the suggested changes and provide the board with the changes at the next meeting.

1. New Business; **None**
2. Other Business; **None**

1.

2.

1. ZA / Planning Commission Comments: **None**
2. Public Comments; (Limited to three minutes per person unless extended by Chairman).

**Charlie Smith:** Recalls that this was originally 40 pages in length and was provided by a landscape architect. 19.05 following minimum standards planting would have to be provided MSU. This whole thing is for commercial property. Move governmental to level three. Was under the impression that this is for all properties in the township.

**Deeren:** Any SUP coming forward once this is adopted then they are required to follow this ordinance. This does not apply to single family homes being constructed only businesses and PUD’s.

**Hanaha Popa:** Appreciates the board looking into ADU’s and believes that this will allow for generational families to come into the area.

**Judy Janosk:** Tiny homes are allowed?

**Deeren:** Yes, the township allows for a home of a minimum of 400 square feet, which is the smallest seen in any ordinance.

1. Adjournment;

Morgan adjournment at 7:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Christina Deeren, Recording Secretary