

Pleasanton Township Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

DATE: 6/13/2022 6:00 p.m.

LOCATION: Pleasanton Township Hall

Representatives:

X	Bob Peterson - Chair	X	Ed Monk
X	Rochelle Rollenhagen – Vice Chair	X	Kathy Runyon
		X	Brenda Monk – Township Board Rep / Secretary
A	Carol Merrill – Township Supervisor		
	Guests:	X	Josh Mills, Zoning Administrator

X = Present A = Absent

Public Present: Laurie Hietanen, Paul Hietanen, Pauline Jaquish, Elizabeth Ozden, Cathy Walther, Bob Wurstner, Jacque Erdman, Susan Schankin, Fred Schankin, Judy Girven, Rick Kirk, Brenda Kirk, Deb Jackson, Nancy Yate, Cindy Rutgers, Don Raff, Katie Swanson, Linda Schweyer, Jerry Dobek, Roger Anderson, Paul Koon,

Topics Discussed	Discussion/Decision	Action/Responsible Party
<i>Meeting called to order. Pledge of Allegiance</i>		
<i>Roll call</i>	Present: Peterson, Rollenhagen, E. Monk, Runyon, B. Monk	
<i>Agenda Approval</i>	Agenda presented for approval/changes.	<i>Motion by Rollenhagen, second by E. Monk to approve the agenda. All in favor, motion carried.</i>
<i>Prior meeting minutes</i>	May 9, 2022, Meeting Minutes	<i>Motion by E. Monk, second by Rollenhagen, to approve meeting minutes. All in favor, motion carried.</i>
<i>Open Public Hearing</i>	<p>Opened at 6:02 p.m. Public Hearing on two Ordinance Amendments.</p> <p><u>Removal of SECTION 8007.B – Substitution Re: Nonconforming Lots</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current Ordinance: <p style="padding-left: 40px;">8007. - SUBSTITUTION: B. With the approval of the Zoning Administrator, a nonconforming use, building or structure may be replaced by or substituted with a higher use even though such replacement or substitution does not change the nonconforming status of such use, building or structure in the land use district in which it is located.</p> <p>No public comment noted.</p> <p><u>Change to ARTICLE 10: GENERAL PROVISIONS; 1004. - GENERAL PROVISIONS</u></p>	<i>Motion by B. Monk, second by Rollenhagen to send ordinance 8007 up to township board for approval. All in favor, motion carried.</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current Ordinance: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. No direct light source, which is not defused or shaded shall be permitted which is visible from any property or from any public street, road, or highway. • Change: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. No direct light source, which is not defused or shaded shall be permitted. <p>B. Monk read letters received regarding 1004 Ordinance change. Letters from Dick and Carol Merrill, Douglas Tinnette and Susan and Fred Schankin.</p> <p>L. Hietanen-noted letters to township were good things to consider. Concerned regarding lights trespass from Park to Dayton Club. Consider Enforcement, flag lights, retrofit, lake lights for docking at night. Supportive of issue to support night sky.</p> <p>J. Dobek – Northwest Michigan College – TC. Has Written 15 lighting ordinances, proactive ordinances with master plan. Offered services to assist at no charge. Preserve night sky. Provided three sample ordinances to commission. Any questions – he is available.</p> <p>Roger Anderson, from Arcadia - Amateur Astronomer. Anything to preserve the night sky is the way to go. Active in Arcadia Township. Noted NASA does studies on lights in night sky.</p> <p>C. Rutgers – Sky and Telescope/International National Parks – there are fifteen communities via dark sky designation. No one lives there. Six state parks. Ordinance should not be too rigid, not too lax. Must be able to enforce. There are other areas to view dark sky as noted in Carol’s letter. Lights downward encouraged.</p> <p>P. Koon – Bear Lake vs Pleasanton – one size fits all? Need for lights city vs rural. People need to see. Specific lighting?</p> <p>J. Erdman – Would like to see using offer by J. Dobek for lighting. What is available vs how enforced. Go out to Arcadia dunes area. Research</p>	<p><i>Motion by B. Monk, second by Rollenhagen to send ordinance 1004 up to township board for approval. All in favor, motion carried.</i></p>
--	---	--

and come up with ordinance that is enforceable.
This for considering.

R. Kirk – West side of glover’s lake, understands need for lights on property as well as infringing on my neighbors’ lights. Who is going to enforce? Porch light vs Christmas lights, concerned with infringing on my neighbor.

Harold? – 20-year-old happy astronomer. Likes the dark skies. Cannot say an increase of light, for the most part has no issues. Concerned with harsh lighting. Has motion lighting at home on for a minute for fox, coyote etc. Understands difficulty with enforcement. U of M astronomy group meets over Ann Arbor in a residential area. Infrared is another option that maybe available.

D. Raff – Applaud efforts, recalls noise ordinance issues. Interested in topic. When he sent out an email, he received 10/12 emails of interest. Community cares about each other. Applaud commission on taking on the topic. Wishes you luck. Applauds Dayton Club lights that they turn off and only have on when boats are coming back to dock.

K. Swanson – has switched house to LEDs. Concerned with security of driveway and home. Originally from Ann Arbor. Can see stars in the sky, not like village of Bear Lake. More details may be needed, enforcement may be hard. Deflect light where it is needed.

S. Shankin – situation affecting her personally. Did light display with lamp showing different light w/shield. Light travels, cool bulbs travel further. Light pollution effecting community.

J. Mills – noted on new permits noting downward lighting.

Rollenhagen questioned the end goal and definition. Mills noted no complaints with discussion on dense areas vs rural and density. Definition of what downward means.

J. Dobek – discussed ordinance lighting and educational process. Proper lighting for safety and security. Definition with no ambiguity, defining each piece. Referenced White Water ordinance example.

	<p>Received Interest Survey petition from S. Schankin. Interest survey notes: We, the taxpayers of Pleasanton Township support the Pleasanton Twp Masterplan to maintain the scenic rural character of the community, the quiet that comes with less development, little traffic, and a dark sky at night unspoiled by the lights of urban development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A zoning ordinance to ensure the inclusion of standards that state development shall not pollute or degrade scenic views or nighttime dark sky. - A zoning ordinance to provide protection for sensitive features including nighttime skies. - A ordinance that supports fully shield light fixtures, directed down and a warm color light (CCT < 2800K) <p>Public Hearing closed at 6:42 pm</p>	
Zoning Administrator Report	<p>Zoning Report reviewed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May 2022 Report • Additional documentation from Midwest V, LLC regarding Dollar General. Scheduled Public Hearing for next Planning Commission meeting on July 11, 2022. 	<i>B. Monk will send out notice for Public Hearing and post on web site.</i>
New Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peterson invited J. Dobek as guest for next Planning Commission meeting on July 11, 2022. 	
Unfinished Business/Discussions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	
Correspondence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	
Public Comment	<p>D.Raff – Unintended commitment to Master Plan / Ordinance. Park lighting concern encouraging usage after dark.</p> <p>J. Dobek – Take into consideration upgrading ordinance.</p> <p>S. Schankin – Why approve now if working in in future months? Discussed Park</p> <p>J. Erdman – noted park changes and security reasons. Noted lighting discussed with contractor.</p>	
Board Comment	None	
Adjournment	<p>Meeting Adjourned at 7:30 p.m. Next meeting date: July 11, 2022</p>	