



12803 S. Wacousta Rd., Grand Ledge, MI 48837  
517-626-6593  
517-626-6405 (Fax)  
[www.watertownmi.gov](http://www.watertownmi.gov)

## PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, April 3, 2024 | 7:00 pm

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm by Chair Rick Adams with the Pledge of Allegiance.

**PLANNING COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Chair Rick Adams (left at 8:45pm), Vice-Chair Ulrika Zay, Zoning Board of Appeals Representative Charles Openlander, Beth Ball (arrived at 7:34pm), Ron Overton, Andrew Powers, and Richard Turcotte. Absent was Secretary John Wiesner.

In the absence of Secretary Wiesner, Zoning Board of Appeals Representative Openlander will serve as Acting Secretary.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Township Manager Jennifer Tubbs and Planning Director Andrea Polverento.

**COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED:** Polverento outlined the communications received.

### AGENDA APPROVAL:

Motion by Davis, seconded by Overton, to approve the April 3, 2024 regular meeting agenda as presented. Motion carried.

**PUBLIC COMMENT, NON-AGENDA ITEMS:** None.

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

#### 1. March 6, 2024 Regular Meeting

Polverento stated that Ball had requested that the last line under the final public comments be stricken from the minutes. Turcotte, Overton, and Zay stated that the draft as proposed reflected their recollections of the comments made by the Township Manager.

Motion by Turcotte, seconded by Overton, to approve the regular meeting minutes of March 6, 2024 as presented. Motion carried.

### PUBLIC HEARINGS:

#### 1. Case No. 24-03 SLU – House of Promise – 15275 Francis Road

Chair Adams opened the public hearing at 7:10pm. The public hearing procedure was summarized.

Polverento drew the Planning Commission's attention to written comments which had been received, one of which was included in the packet of materials provided in advance of the meeting, and one of which was on the table, having been received that day.

Polverento presented the facts of the case, a request to amend Special Land Use Permit No. 18-02, to expand the campus of the House of Promise. She introduced Ms. Shari Montgomery, Executive Director of the House of Promise. The amendment, if approved, would allow construction of a 4,323 square foot boarding facility. This facility would house a maximum of six occupants, with one on-site staff person. Polverento referenced the site and construction plans which were provided, noting that the construction was designed to look like a single-family home. Polverento referenced conceptual plans the applicant provided for potential future expansion, noting that this application is for the single boarding facility, described at Building A on the site plan. She also noted that the staff report provided went into detail on the zoning requirements for this type of use, including parking and other considerations.

Powers asked about the capacity of the existing and proposed facilities. Polverento responded that the main facility serves a maximum of twelve students, with the proposed facility to serve a maximum of six additional students.

Adams asked for clarification on the square footage of the proposed facility. Polverento explained that the total area is 4,323 square feet, with 2,435 square feet on the main floor, and 1,888 square feet on the finished lower level. Adams noted that the site is 5.4 acres.

Davis asked about the age range of the current and expected students. Montgomery responded that they only accept adults over 18 years, and up to 50 years old. They do not admit students under 18 due to licensing requirements. Most residents are between 20-50 years old.

Turcotte asked Polverento to describe the standard regulations for lot size in the AG-Agricultural District. Polverento reminded the Planning Commission that lots in the AG zoning district have a minimum one-acre lot size, with 150 feet of frontage on a public road. Turcotte noted that the property is 5.4 acres, and that five buildings are proposed long-term. Polverento also noted that the staff report referenced two parcel numbers, however, the property owner had worked with the assessing office to combine those parcels, and that a new parcel number had been issued for the 5.4 acres.

Adams asked about comments received from the Drain Commissioner's office regarding the septic system serving the main facility, and if this proposed facility would require a new mound system. Polverento responded that the Drain office had indicated that the main facility is served by a mound system, but that the new septic system serving the proposed facility would be a standard, cut-in, at grade system. Polverento stated that she spoke with the Mid-Michigan District Health Department (MMDHD), having referred the Drain office's comments, and the MMDHD noted that due to the design of this proposed system, they did not anticipate drainage issues. Adams wondered why, if this was heavier clay soils, the main facility had a mound system. Montgomery responded that the installation of the mound system was atypical. The MMDHD tested five areas and they all met the perc test requirements for a standard system. Montgomery added that they may seek to replace the mound system serving the main facility with a standard system in the future.

Davis asked how long the House of Promise had been operational. Montgomery responded that they had been operating for six years. Davis asked if, during that time, any major issues had been encountered, such as law enforcement responses or similar issues. Montgomery responded that the House of Promise tries to stay very quiet. She said that there have been ambulance responses, more out of an abundance of caution, they would rather provide professional emergency medical response to their residents. In terms of law enforcement, they have not had any trouble with the staff or residents of the House of Promise. There were a few situations where a staff member was spooked, and they asked for the Sheriff's Department to

respond. She added that they have a good relationship with the Sheriff's Department, they know what the facility is, and they have a protocol for a specific type of response.

Polverento added that the Sheriff's Department had been notified of this application, and they responded that they had no issues or concerns with the proposal.

Zay asked if the House of Promise had a main administrative office that was off-site. Montgomery responded that the offices for the facility are onsite.

Openlander, referring back to the discussion on the mound septic system, noted that for a time, the health department preferred the mound systems, and oversaw the installation of substantially more of them than they do now.

Turcotte asked staff if Francis Road was an all-season road. Polverento responded that it is.

There being no further questions for staff, Adams offered Ms. Montgomery, the applicant, the opportunity to make any comments.

Montgomery stated that the House of Promise tries to stay quiet, they don't wish to be known. They like to keep a low profile, and they try to keep traffic to a minimum. Any visitors must call before stopping, anyone who does pull in is immediately questioned. She said that the proposed construction will be a beautiful home, and that she believes they will add value to the neighborhood. They keep the property well-maintained. Montgomery added that her dream for the property is for it to be a sanctuary, she wants it to be beautiful and quiet. She wants to be a blessing to the community, not a hinderance.

Bonnie McKrill, 15300 S. Francis Road, interjected, asking if it was true that some of the girls came from the Ingham County jail and were dropped off. McKrill said she saw people in orange jumpsuits. Montgomery responded that the allegation was not true.

Adams reminded the audience that it was Ms. Montgomery's time to speak, and that everyone would have a chance to comment when she concluded her remarks.

Montgomery stated that she has proved over the six years they have been in operation that they been successful. Overton stated that, by definition, they are not trying to draw any attention to themselves. Montgomery agreed.

Adams asked the Planning Commissioners if they had any questions for the applicant.

Davis asked Ms. Montgomery about the timeline for construction. Montgomery responded that they hoped to break ground on Building A as described on the site plan in May. They have secured funding for the construction of Building A from a donor and are ready to go, as soon as they have township approval. The future construction shown on the site plan will be dependent on fundraising. Montgomery did not expect this construction to be necessary so soon, she did not realize how great the need was when she started the House of Promise.

Overton clarified that the buildings shown as B, C, and D on the site plan will be based on funding, and need. Overton noted that the House of Promise does not receive any funding from the township.

Montgomery added that she receives no local, state, or federal funding. Her financial support is from within the community.

Zay asked, given the demand and the need to expand, if they had looked for an existing structure, an existing home. Why does this all need to be on the same parcel?

Montgomery responded that her dream was to have a campus. It is so much more efficient with staffing, and to be able to offer on-site opportunities for growth to the students they serve. The students have familiar staff following them through the process, it's a much more effective system.

Zay asked Montgomery if it was her dream when the original special use permit was approved to have this expanded campus. Montgomery replied that it was. She did not expect to be able to expand this quickly, or that the need would be so great, but this has always been her dream.

Turcotte asked if they had health care professionals during the day to serve the students. Montgomery said that they do not, but that she hopes to have an in-house therapist in the future.

There being no further questions from the Commissioners for Ms. Montgomery, Adams asked for comments from any individuals from the audience.

Kevin Chapin, 15248 Francis Road, noted that he had submitted one of the letters. Adams acknowledged the letter had been received. Chapin stated that the letter outlined several of their concerns. He noted that the House of Promise has been in harmony with the neighborhood, but his concern is that will change. By adding more capacity, it will mean more staff coming and going, and it will be more prominent. People are accustomed to seeing this one building there today, by adding buildings, it will bring more traffic and raise the visibility of this facility. Currently, there are quite a few cars that park at the main house during the day. Chapin would see this going up considerably based on the number of people they would be adding to the facility. This would mean more staff, more therapists, more maintenance and upkeep providers, etc. Chapin reiterated that this would raise the visibility of the site. He expects that most people going by don't know it's the House of Promise, which is good for the residents, but he thinks that this expansion will change that aspect tremendously.

Chapin said that they have lived across the street for approximately three years. When they purchased their property, it was their understanding they wouldn't see this type of change there. He feels this special land use permit goes beyond what he thinks most of the neighborhood would prefer. He thinks it's safe to say most people don't speak up, but he ventures to guess that many people, if they understood the extent of the expansion proposed, would be hesitant to want this approved.

Adams noted to Chapin that it sounded like he was speaking more about if the four buildings were constructed over time, not just Building A which was being considered. Chapin agreed that he was looking at the full expansion plan. Chapin said that historically, with this facility formerly being an event venue, which was closed for many of the reasons they noted in their letter, this feels like it's slipping back into something that got the previous use shut down. As this continues to grow, he thinks we will just be back to where that was, being disallowed and closed. As this expansion continues, it is turning into something that he would rather not have across the road.

Adams understands Chapin's position, but stated that this application only deals with Building A, not the whole plan. Chapin understands, but noted that his position was that he preferred no additional expansion on the property to occur.

Polverento noted for the record that the former event venue was an illegal use, which was why it was shut down. Overton noted that the previous owners did not attempt to obtain the proper permits.

Adams noted that Chapin's letter described possible light pollution. Adams asked Montgomery if they planned to install floodlights or anything similar.

Montgomery responded that they did not expect to install floodlights. They may have some minimal lighting, she pictured maybe a street light or something similar. Chapin stated that he feels adding lighting is likely to make the facility more visible to those going by.

Powers asked that, given the discussion about people and traffic, if Montgomery could explain if any of the student residents had their own cars. Montgomery stated that most of the women who come to the House of Promise come with the clothes on their back. It's very uncommon for them to have a vehicle, although occasionally it does happen. For example, one of their residents came with a vehicle, but for the first year she was there, she was not able to drive it, it was just parked at the facility. They have three executive staff who park there regularly, and they have two day staff from 7am-5pm. They may have a volunteer during the day. After 5pm, they only have one staff member, so the parking lot is relatively empty overnight. If they are allowed to add another house, they are likely adding two cars.

Chapin said that he agrees with Montgomery's statement that overnight there are not many cars, but that during the day he sees anywhere from five to 12 cars parked there. Montgomery clarified that they have staff meetings on Wednesdays which may bring more vehicles to the site. Chapin described the type and speed of traffic on Francis Road.

Montgomery added that they are closing off the circle drive, eliminating one of the entrances off Francis Road.

McKrill asked if that was going to be on her side. Montgomery stated that the horseshoe drive would be closed. McKrill said that when the snow was plowed out of the House of Promise it all ends up in her driveway. All the gravel from their drive is in her driveway.

Adams asked Chapin if he was through with his comments. He said he was. Adams invited Ms. McKrill to speak.

McKrill said that she has had problems since she moved in. First it was the wedding venue, with 200-300 people every Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. She's had trash, she's had her trees ruined, she's had two bushes uprooted, and she is right across the street and had to put up with this. Now she has to put up with this House of Promise. McKrill has seen the girls going next door and making out with guys at the rental garage and the hot rod club. She sees it all. McKrill has had more trouble and has paid more than \$1,800 per tree that has been hit by traffic. She has been through 13 mailboxes. She doesn't see the House of Promise helping her pay for this. Three trees at \$1,800 a piece she has had to have taken down because they have been hit. McKrill said that Montgomery wants to say how good this place is, but there is traffic in and out of there all day long. She wants to know who is going to feel sorry for her. She has been there since 1983 and put up with this. The wedding venue, now the House of Promise, and they want to build

more and bring in more people. The traffic on Francis Road is unbelievable. McKrill says her property has been ruined.

Davis asked McKrill how many of the property issues have occurred in the past six years since the change of ownership of the House of Promise property. McKrill responded that three trees and two bushes had been damaged.

Montgomery noted that those issues had nothing to do with the House of Promise.

McKrill stated that the traffic on Francis Road goes 50-70 miles per hour past her house. There have been accidents. Semis from the Love's gas station go by and won't be able to slow down. More people, more problems. She thinks that the Planning Commission should think about that, since she has to put up with it.

Adams thanked McKrill for her comments. He asked Montgomery if she would like to respond to any of Ms. McKrill's comments. Montgomery stated that she was sorry for McKrill's trees, but that the House of Promise didn't have anything to do with the damage. McKrill interjected that Montgomery wanted her house, that Montgomery wanted McKrill to donate her house so that she didn't have to pay property taxes.

Montgomery responded that she was sorry for Ms. McKrill's trees. She agreed that traffic on Francis Road is busy, which is why they want to eliminate the circle drive. Montgomery thinks that Francis Road is the type of road a house like theirs should be built on, because it has more capacity than a neighborhood street would. McKrill again interjected that Montgomery wanted her to donate her house. McKrill said that Montgomery came over to ask her that, then she wouldn't have to pay for her property taxes.

Adams reminded Ms. McKrill that it was Montgomery's opportunity to speak. Montgomery acknowledged that she had stopped at Ms. McKrill's property, and that they had been talking, and Ms. McKrill complained about her property taxes. Montgomery added that she had flippantly offered that if Ms. McKrill donated –

McKrill interrupted, saying that Montgomery was not welcome on her property. It has "No Trespassing" signs all over.

Chapin said that he understood that the House of Promise only has funding for this one building, but what happens when she gets this built, but doesn't have the funding to keep the facility running.

There being no further public comment, the public hearing was closed at 7:50pm.

## **NEW BUSINESS:**

### **1. Case No. 24-03 SPR/SLU – House of Promise – 15275 Francis Road**

Staff reviewed the specific special land use requirements with the Planning Commission.

The following standards are taken from Article 6 of the Zoning Ordinance, and are the basis for review by both Township staff, Planning Commission and Township Board. The Planning Commission reviewed each standard, and suggests the following conclusions:

*General Review Standards.* Each application shall be reviewed for the purpose of determining that the proposed special land use meets all of the general standards. Each special land use will:

- (A) Be designed, constructed, operated and maintained so as to be harmonious and appropriate in appearance, with the existing or intended character of the general vicinity and that such a use will not change the essential character of the area in which it is proposed;

<b>Complies</b>	Does not Comply	Condition of Approval	Not Applicable
-----------------	-----------------	-----------------------	----------------

**Comments:** The proposed use meets this standard. The proposed construction is to be designed and constructed to resemble similar single-family residential buildings in the vicinity so as not to change the essential character of the area.

*Zay argued that it does not comply. The reason for her thinking is based upon the age of the existing structure, it being built in the late 1800s. She also looked at the tree sizes, and the existing carriage house, although it's unknown if it was original to the house. Zay understands that the funding is from private sources, and that she realizes that her comments are generally only relevant when something is publicly funded. She is familiar with the site, and has taken a tour of the home. It is a remarkable and beautiful property. She appreciates the work of the family who restored it. The home, the trees, and the carriage house have a presence, and it is somewhat unique in the township. She thinks that building anything on this 5.4 acre property, which is subject to a special land use permit, but to expand and to build new structures and a new road will completely change the character of that site. Zay reiterated that this was her opinion, and she doesn't feel as though it's something that would be enforceable by historic preservation, because of the private source of the funding. Zay thinks that if the funding was from federal sources, they would not be able to do this project. Zay thinks that while the review standard is subjective, she feels it does not comply.*

- (B) Be served adequately by essential public facilities and services such as highways, streets, police, fire protection, drainage structures, refuse disposal, water and sewage facilities;

<b>Complies</b>	Does not Comply	<b>Condition of Approval</b>	Not Applicable
-----------------	-----------------	------------------------------	----------------

**Comments:** The proposed use is adequately served by highways and roads, and police and fire protection. There is no public water or sanitary sewer service available to the site, onsite well and septic facilities are adequate. The County Drain Commissioner provided minor comments relating to driveway drainage which are included as a proposed condition of approval.

- (C) Not create excessive additional requirements at public cost for public facilities and services;

<b>Complies</b>	Does not Comply	Condition of Approval	Not Applicable
-----------------	-----------------	-----------------------	----------------

**Comments:** The proposed use is not expected to create excessive additional requirements at public cost.

- (D) No involve uses, activities, processes, materials, and equipment or conditions of operation that will be detrimental to any persons, property or the general welfare by reason of excessive effects of traffic, noise, smoke, fumes, glare, or odors affecting adjacent properties, streets, or uses;

Complies      Does not Comply      **Condition of Approval**      Not Applicable

**Comments:**      The proposed use is expected to comply with this requirement; a condition of approval indicating as such has been included.

- (E) The proposed use is so designed, located, planned and to be operated that the public health, safety and welfare will not be adversely impacted; and

**Complies**      Does not Comply      Condition of Approval      Not Applicable

**Comments:**      The proposed use is expected to comply with this requirement.

- (F) The proposed use shall not be detrimental to existing and/or other permitted land uses in the zoning district.

**Complies**      Does not Comply      Condition of Approval      Not Applicable

**Comments:**      The proposed use is expected to comply with this requirement.

Motion by Davis, seconded by Powers, that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Trustees approval of Case No. 24-03 SLU for Shari Montgomery of the House of Promise, for an amendment to Special Land Use Permit No. 17-02, to authorize expansion of the campus of the House of Promise, in a phased approach, with Phase 1 of construction to include a 4,323 square foot boarding facility, and future phases to include two additional boarding facilities and a community center of similar size, in accordance with their existing permit to operate a private boarding school at 15275 Francis Road, in Section 27 of Watertown Charter Township, provided that conformance to conditions 1-10, as noted below, are achieved to the satisfaction of the Township Zoning Administrator as being in accordance with the requirements of the Watertown Charter Township Zoning Ordinance.

Condition of Approval for **Special Land Use Permit No. 24-03:**

1. The applicant shall maintain compliance with Variance No. 17-09.
2. The applicant shall receive approval for and maintain compliance with the final site plan.
3. The applicant shall comply with the requirements of the Mid-Michigan District Health Department.
4. The applicant shall comply with the recommendations of the Clinton County Drain Commissioner's office relating to driveway drainage.
5. Outdoor lighting shall comply with Section 28-5.18 of the Watertown Charter Township Zoning Ordinance.
6. Any signage shall meet the requirements of the township's sign ordinance and permits shall be obtained.
7. The applicant shall meet the requirements of the Township Building Official.



8. The applicant shall meet the requirements of the Looking Glass Regional Fire Authority and the Clinton County Sheriff, if applicable.
9. The proposed use shall not involve uses, activities, processes, materials, and equipment or conditions of operation that will be detrimental to any persons, property or the general welfare by reason of excessive effects of traffic, noise, smoke, fumes, glare, or odors affecting adjacent properties, streets, or uses.
10. Applicant must comply with all applicable State, Federal and Township laws.

Roll call vote:

Yes: Adams, Openlander, Powers, Ball, Davis, Overton, Turcotte

No: Zay

Absent: Wiesner

Motion carried.

The following standards are taken from Article 6 of the Zoning Ordinance, and are the basis for review by both Township staff and the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission reviewed each standard, and made the following conclusions:

- (1) *Master plan.* The general purposes and spirit of this chapter and the comprehensive development plan of the township shall be maintained.

<b>Complies</b>	Does not Comply	Condition of Approval	Not Applicable
-----------------	-----------------	-----------------------	----------------

**Comments:** The proposed use is consistent with goals, objectives, and implementation strategies of the master plan.

- (2) *Health, safety and welfare.* The uses proposed will not adversely affect the public health, safety, or welfare. The site shall be developed so as not to impede the normal and orderly development or improvement of surrounding property for uses permitted in this chapter.

<b>Complies</b>	Does not Comply	Condition of Approval	Not Applicable
-----------------	-----------------	-----------------------	----------------

**Comments:** The proposed use is not expected to adversely affect the public health, safety, or welfare, nor impede the orderly development of surrounding properties.

- (3) *Access.* Safe, convenient, uncontested, efficient and well-defined vehicular and pedestrian circulation shall be provided for ingress/egress points and within the site. All streets and driveways shall be developed in accordance with the township subdivision control ordinance, the county road commission, and the state department of transportation specifications, as applicable. The proposed development shall be serviced by an adequate road system, and shall not adversely impact the level of service on adjacent roads.

<b>Complies</b>	Does not Comply	Condition of Approval	Not Applicable
-----------------	-----------------	-----------------------	----------------

**Comments:** Safe and efficient onsite traffic flow is provided. No new ingress/egress points are proposed.

- (4) *Emergency vehicle access.* All buildings and groups of buildings shall be arranged so as to permit reasonable necessary emergency vehicle access as requested by the fire department serving the township.

**Complies**      Does not Comply      Condition of Approval      Not Applicable

**Comments:**      The existing and proposed buildings have adequate access by the fire department serving the township.

- (5) *Pedestrian circulation.* A pedestrian circulation system which is separated from the vehicular circulation system may be required. In order to ensure public safety, pedestrian measures such as sidewalks, crosswalks, crossing signals and other such facilities may be required in the vicinity of schools, playgrounds, shopping areas, or other uses which generate a considerable amount of pedestrian traffic.

**Complies**      Does not Comply      Condition of Approval      **Not Applicable**

**Comments:**      The proposed use will not cause any adverse impacts to pedestrians. Sidewalk areas between the main parking area and the facility are provided for.

- (6) *Natural features.* Removal or alteration of significant natural features shall be restricted to those areas which are reasonably necessary to develop the site in accordance with the requirements of this chapter.

**Complies**      Does not Comply      Condition of Approval      Not Applicable

**Comments:**      There is no proposed removal or alteration of significant natural features.

- (7) *Topography.* The landscape shall be preserved in its natural state, insofar as practical, by removing only those areas of vegetation or making those alterations to the topography which are reasonably necessary to develop the site in accordance with the requirements of this chapter.

**Complies**      Does not Comply      Condition of Approval      Not Applicable

**Comments:**      No major site grading is anticipated. A Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control permit waiver has been received.

- (8) *Drainage.* To provide areas for natural habitat, preserve natural drainage patterns and maintain the natural characteristics of the land, areas of natural drainage such as swales, wetlands, ponds, or swamps shall be protected and preserved insofar as practical in their natural state.

**Complies**      Does not Comply      **Condition of Approval**      Not Applicable

**Comments:**      The applicant shall comply with the recommendations of the Clinton County Drain Commissioner regarding driveway drainage.

- (9) *Stormwater management.* Appropriate measures shall be taken to ensure that removal of surface waters will not adversely affect neighboring properties or the public storm drainage system. Provisions shall be made to accommodate stormwater, prevent erosion and the formation of dust.

Complies      Does not Comply      **Condition of Approval**      Not Applicable

**Comments:**      The applicant shall comply with the recommendations of the Clinton County Drain Commissioner regarding driveway drainage.

- (10) *Landscaping.* Landscaping, landscape buffers and greenbelts shall be provided and designed in accordance with Article VIII of this chapter.

**Complies**      Does not Comply      Condition of Approval      Not Applicable

**Comments:**      No landscape buffer is required, the property is zoned AG and is surrounded on all sides by property zoned AP and AG.

- (11) *Privacy.* To minimize or prevent trespassing or other adverse effects of adjacent lands, the site plan shall provide reasonable visual and sound privacy for all uses located therein, and adjacent thereto.

Complies      Does not Comply      Condition of Approval      **Not Applicable**

**Comments:**      There is no proposed fencing or gate for the use.

- (12) *Lighting.* To reduce artificial light pollution, avoid light trespass on to adjacent property and improve travel conditions by reducing glare and excessively lit surfaces, exterior lighting shall be in accordance with Sec. 28-5.18, Outdoor lighting.

Complies      Does not Comply      **Condition of Approval**      Not Applicable

**Comments:**      The proposed use shall comply with Sec. 28-5.18, Outdoor Lighting.

- (13) *Outside approvals.* Site plans shall conform to all applicable requirements of county, state, federal, and township statutes and ordinances. Approval may be conditioned on the applicant receiving necessary county, state, federal, and township permits before final site plan approval is granted.

Complies      Does not Comply      **Condition of Approval**      Not Applicable

**Comments:**      This is a regular requirement of all applicants.

Motion by Powers, seconded by Overton, that the Planning Commission approve Case No. 24-03 SPR for Shari Montgomery of the House of Promise, for final site plan review for expansion of the campus of the House of Promise, in a phased approach, with Phase 1 of construction to include a 4,323 square foot boarding facility, and future phases to include two additional boarding facilities and a community center

of similar size at 15275 Francis Road in Section 27 of Watertown Charter Township, provided that conformance to conditions 1-9, as noted below, are achieved to the satisfaction of the Township Zoning Administrator as being in accordance with the requirements of the Watertown Charter Township Zoning Ordinance.

Conditions of **Final Site Plan Approval**:

1. The applicant shall maintain compliance with the requirements of Variance No. 17-09 and Special Land Use Permit No. 24-03.
2. The applicant shall comply with the requirements of the Mid-Michigan District Health Department.
3. The applicant shall comply with the requirements of the Clinton County Drain Commissioner.
4. The applicant shall comply with the requirements of the Clinton County Building Department regarding Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control, if applicable.
5. The applicant shall obtain all required building and trade permits, and comply with the requirements of the Township Building Official.
6. The applicant shall comply with the requirements of the Looking Glass Regional Fire Authority and Clinton County Sheriff's Department, if applicable.
7. Outdoor lighting shall comply with Section 28-5.18 of the Watertown Charter Township Zoning Ordinance.
8. Any signage shall meet the requirements of the township's sign ordinance and permits shall be obtained.
9. Applicant must comply with all applicable State, Federal and Township laws.

Roll call vote:

Yes: Overton, Adams, Turcotte, Powers, Ball, Davis, Openlander

No: Zay

Absent: Wiesner

Motion carried.

*The Planning Commission took a five-minute break at 8:30pm and resumed at 8:35pm.*

**4. Update on Monroe v. Watertown Charter Township, Et al.**

Polverento provided an update on the court case related to 16150 Grove Road.

No action taken.

**5. Update on Case No. 24-01 ZBA**

The Planning Commission briefly discussed the action taken by the Zoning Board of Appeals at their meeting on March 13, 2024.

No action taken.

**2. Proposed Bylaw Amendments**

The Planning Commission considered a proposed amendment to Bylaw 1.1 – Election and Term of Officers, which provided a method for removal of an officer of the Planning Commission.

Motion by Overton, seconded by Davis, to adopt the proposed amendment to bylaw 1.1, as presented.

Roll call:

Yes: Turcotte, Openlander, Ball, Overton, Powers, Zay, Davis

No: None

Absent: Wiesner, Adams

Motion carried.

The Planning Commission considered a proposed amendment to Bylaw 1.5 – Duties of the Secretary. This amendment provides for written notice of emergency Executive Committee meetings and for notification and provision of a digital packet for Zoning Board of Appeals meetings. Various suggestions were considered. No action was taken, but this will be reconsidered at the Planning Commission's next regular meeting.

The Planning Commission considered a proposed amendment to Bylaw 1.6 – Representative to the Zoning Board of Appeals, which adds a statement prohibiting the Zoning Board of Appeals Representative from serving on the Ordinance Review Committee.

Motion by Powers, seconded by Davis, to adopt the proposed amendment to bylaw 1.6, as presented.

Roll call:

Yes: Powers, Ball, Zay, Overton, Openlander, Davis, Turcotte

No: None

Absent: Wiesner, Adams

Motion carried.

The Planning Commission considered a minor textual change to Bylaw 2.0 - Meetings.

Motion by Powers, seconded by Overton, to adopt the proposed amendment to bylaw 2.0, as presented.

Roll call:

Yes: Zay, Overton, Turcotte, Powers, Ball, Davis, Openlander

No: None

Absent: Adams, Wiesner

Motion carried.

The Planning Commission considered a proposed amendment to Bylaw 2.1 – Regular Meetings, to include elections as a justification for rescheduling a regular meeting.

Motion by Powers, seconded by Davis, to adopt the proposed amendment to Bylaw 2.1, as presented.

Roll call:

Yes: Ball, Turcotte, Powers, Zay, Overton, Openlander, Davis

No: None

Absent: Adams, Wiesner

Motion carried.

The Planning Commission considered a proposed amendment to Bylaw 3.5 – Executive Committee, to authorize replacement of the Zoning Board of Appeals Representative on the Executive Committee with

---

an At-Large member if the ZBA Representative also serves as an officer of the Planning Commission; and that interviews and evaluations conducted by the Executive Committee are subject to the review and approval of the Planning Commission.

Motion by Powers, seconded by Davis, to adopt the proposed amendments to Bylaw 3.5, as presented.

Roll call:

Yes: Davis, Powers, Ball, Openlander, Zay, Turcotte, Overton

No: None

Absent, Adams, Wiesner

Motion carried.

### **3. Officer Elections**

Adams was nominated for the office of Chair. There were no other nominations for Chair.

Motion by Turcotte, seconded by Davis, to elect Richard Adams to the office of Chair of the Planning Commission for a one-year term. Motion carried.

Zay was nominated for the office of Vice-Chair. There were no other nominations for Vice-Chair.

Motion by Davis, seconded by Turcotte, to elect Ulrika Zay to the office of Vice-Chair of the Planning Commission for a one-year term. Motion carried.

Powers was nominated for the office of Secretary. There were no other nominations for Vice-Chair.

Motion by Turcotte, seconded by Ball, to elect Andrew Powers to the office of Secretary of the Planning Commission for a one-year term. Motion carried.

Adams was nominated for the office of Representative to the Zoning Board of Appeals. There were no other nominations for Representative to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Motion by Turcotte, seconded by Powers, to recommend to the Board of Trustees the appointment of Richard Adams as the Planning Commission's Representative to the Zoning Board of Appeals. Motion carried.

### **6. Review Scope of Delegated Authority to Zoning Administrator on Site Plan Approvals**

The Planning Commission discussed whether the site plan review committee may need to meet more frequently. Polverento suggested that she could review the past several years of site plans, and develop some criteria to determine when it would be appropriate and useful for the site plan review committee to meet.

No action taken.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS:** None.

### **COMMITTEE AND STAFF REPORTS:**

1. Executive Committee Report – None.
2. Ordinance Review Committee Report – None.
3. Site Plan Review Committee Report – None.
4. Board of Trustees Report – Overton provided the Board of Trustees report.
5. Zoning Board of Appeals Report – None.
6. Capital Improvements Committee Report – None.
7. Staff Reports: Assistant & Director’s Reports – Polverento provided the staff reports.

**COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM AUDIENCE, STAFF, AND COMMISSIONERS:** None.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Motion by Powers, seconded by Ball, to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 9:59pm.

Date approved: 5/1/24

\_\_\_\_\_  
Rick Adams, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Charles Openlander, Acting Secretary