

Pleasanton Township Planning Committee Special Meeting

Minutes

DATE: 7/20/2022 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
X	Carol Merrill – Township Supervisor		
	Guests: Scott Jozwiak, Jozwiak Consulting, Scott Knowlton, Midwest V, LLC	X	Josh Mills, Zoning Administrator

X = Present A = Absent

Public Present: Tom Nettler, John Sedlock, Judy Girven

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. B. Monk requested addendum to agenda to include letter received from Bryan E. Graham, of Young, Graham & Wendling, P.C. Attorneys at Law, dated July 18, 2022.	<i>Motion by Rollenhagen, second by Peterson, to approve the agenda with addendum noted. All in favor, motion carried.</i>
<i>Subject of Special Meeting</i>	<p>Special Use Request under Article 3603 L. Retail Establishments. Request received from Midwest V, LLC, retail store Dollar General.</p> <p>1. Discussion by members of the Planning commission Discussion included sign design presented by consultant. Sign is black lettering, 8’ high with brick to match building. 18 square feet. The lighting of the sign will be from downward/shaded lights vs an illuminated yellow. It was noted that the building and road sign will automatically go off one hour after closing. Permits obtained by contractor/developer: MDOT – approved, waiting for bond and insurance from contractor. Health Department has approved septic and well Storm water approved, Drain Commission Soil Erosion is in process. Changes to site plan in commission packet was a change from 9’ to 10’ parking spaces</p>	

Discussed deliveries on back side of building vs through the front door.
Garbage area discussed regarding fenced in area with lids on the dumpsters.
Community contributions noted by developer include Literacy of Community contributions. Group discussed possibility of farmers market at location. It was noted that the Store Manager has some decision making in this process.
Discussed traffic and clear line of vision for entrance noted on blueprints.

8608. - SPECIAL USE PERMIT STANDARDS:

A. The standards for determining if a Special Use Permit is to be granted or not are:

1. Is the use reasonable and designed to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the community?
Yes
2. Is the use consistent with the intent and purpose of the district?
Yes
3. Is the use compatible with adjacent land uses?
Yes
4. Is the use designed to ensure that public services and facilities are capable of accommodating increased loads caused by the land use or activity?
Yes – MDOT has approved
5. Does the use comply with other general and specific standards of this Ordinance?
Yes

8609. - SPECIAL USE PERMIT CONDITIONS:

A. Special Use Permits can be granted with conditions, limitations, or additional requirements imposed by the commission. Any conditions, limitations or requirements upon which approval is based shall be:

1. Reasonable and designed to protect natural resources, the health, safety, and welfare of the public.
2. Relevant to the social and economic well-

Motion by B. Monk, second by Rollenhagen to approve Special Use Permit with conditions that they meet Federal, State and Local Regulations as well as ZBA conditions. Roll call:
Peterson – Yes

	<p>being of the owners and occupants of the lot in question, of the area adjacent thereto and of the community as a whole.</p> <p>3. A valid exercise of the police power.</p> <p>4. Related to the purposes which are affected by the proposed use or activity.</p> <p>5. Consistent with the intent and purpose of this Ordinance, generally and specifically, for the respective district.</p> <p>6. Designed to insure compatibility with adjacent uses of land and the natural environment, or</p> <p>7. Designed to ensure that public service and facilities affected by a proposed land use or activity will be capable of accommodating increased service and facilitate loads caused by the land use or activity.</p> <p>2. Motion to approve, disapprove, approve with conditions, or postpone action on the Special Use Request. Second to Motion. Member discussion. Vote on motion.</p> <p>3. Site Plan Review – Conducted throughout the meeting as questions were asked and answered.</p>	<p>E Monk – Yes Rollenhagen – Yes Runyon – Yes B Monk – Yes Motion passed.</p> <p>Motion by Rollenhagen, second by E. Monk to approve site plan with changes related to parking sites from 9’ to 10’ in width. All in favor, motion carried.</p>
<i>Correspondence</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional emails received from J. Sedlock, S. Schankin and H. Doran included in commission packet. 	
<i>Public Comment</i>	<p>Sedlock – noted public comment after vote vs prior to. Not in agreement with attorney. Concerned regarding maintenance/ upkeep of area, # of stores is excessive. Noted most have poor maintenance of landscape.</p> <p>T. Nettler – Discussed 40’ foot minimum of unobstructed view to US 31 may not be enough – consultant noted it is more than 40’ in the plans. Hope they are good neighbors and keep the area clean. Questioned Recycling plans for cardboard etc.</p> <p>Merrill – Questioned if any stores have vacated after 15 years or prior.</p>	
<i>Board Comment</i>	None	
<i>Adjournment</i>	Meeting Adjourned at 7:35 p.m.	