DRAFT

LIVINGSTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
County Administration Building
304 E. Grand River Ave.
Howell, Michigan
September 16, 2026
6:30 p.m.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Matt Ikle, Dennis Bowdoin, Bill Call, Margaret Burkholder, Kevin Galbraith

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Sally Witkowski, Chuck Wright

STAFF PRESENT: Scott Barb, Rob Stanford, Martha Haglund

OTHERS PRESENT: Bruce Powelson; Marion Township

---

1. CALL TO ORDER: Meeting was called to order by Planning Commissioner Ikle at 6:30 PM.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. ROLL AND INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Commissioner Action: IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER BOWDOIN TO APPROVE THE AMENDED AGENDA THAT COMBINES ALL PA 116 CASES UNDER ITEM 7A AND REFORMATS THE AGENDA FOR CONSISTENCY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER CALL.

All in favor, Motion Passed 5-0

5. APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES:

Commissioner Action: IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER CALL TO APPROVE THE MINUTES DATED AUGUST 19, 2026, SECONDED BY COMISSIONER BURKHOLDER.

All in Favor, Motion Passed 4-0-1
Galbraith Abstained (Did not attend meeting)

6. CALL TO THE PUBLIC: None

7. REZONING REVIEWS:

A. <u>PA-01-26 DEERFIELD TOWNSHIP, PA 116 AGREEMENT SECTION 28</u>

Section: 28
Acreage: 30.42
Applicant: Dale Laier
Parcel Number: 4703-28-400-022

Staff Recommendation: APPROVAL. This property complies with criteria established by PA 116 as a farm of 5 acres or more in one ownership, but less than 40 acres, with 51% or more of the land area devoted to an agricultural use and produces more than $200 per year.

Commissioner Discussion: None.

Public Comments: None.

PA-02-26 DEERFIELD TOWNSHIP, PA 116 AGREEMENT
SECTION 22

Section: 22
Acreage: 14
Applicant: Dale Laier
Parcel Number: 4703-22-400-006

Staff Recommendation: APPROVAL. This property complies with criteria established by PA 116 as a farm of 5 acres or more in one ownership, but less than 40 acres, with 51% or more of the land area devoted to an agricultural use and produces more than $200 per year.

Commissioner Discussion: None.

Public Comments: None.

PA-03-26 DEERFIELD TOWNSHIP, PA 116 AGREEMENT
SECTION 28

Section: 28
Acreage: 40
Applicant: Dale Laier
Parcel Number: 4703-28-400-003

Staff Recommendation: APPROVAL. This property complies with criteria established by PA 116 as a farm of 40 acres or more with 51% or more of land devoted to agricultural use.

Commissioner Discussion: None.

Public Comments: None.

PA-04-26 DEERFIELD TOWNSHIP, PA 116 AGREEMENT
SECTION 28

Section: 28
Acreage: 40
Applicant: Dale Laier
Parcel Number: 4703-28-400-004

Staff Recommendation: APPROVAL. This property complies with criteria established by PA 116 as a farm of 40 acres or more with 51% or more of land devoted to agricultural use.

Commissioner Discussion: None.

Public Comments: None.

PA-05-26 DEERFIELD TOWNSHIP, PA 116 AGREEMENT
SECTION 24

Section: 24
Acreage: 80

DRAFT

Applicant: Dale Laier
Parcel Number: 4703-24-200-003

Staff Recommendation: APPROVAL. This property complies with criteria established by PA 116 as a farm of 40 acres or more with 51% or more of land devoted to agricultural use.

Commissioner Discussion: None.

Public Comments: None.

PA-06-26 DEERFIELD TOWNSHIP, PA 116 AGREEMENT
SECTION 23

Section: 23
Acreage: 56.65
Applicant: Dale Laier
Parcel Number: 4703-23-400-006

Staff Recommendation: APPROVAL. This property complies with criteria established by PA 116 as a farm of 40 acres or more with 51% or more of land devoted to agricultural use.

Commissioner Discussion: None.

Public Comments: None.

PA-07-26 DEERFIELD TOWNSHIP, PA 116 AGREEMENT
SECTION 22

Section: 22
Acreage: 53.19
Applicant: Dale Laier
Parcel Number: 4703-24-200-017

Staff Recommendation: APPROVAL. This property complies with criteria established by PA 116 as a farm of 40 acres or more with 51% or more of land devoted to agricultural use.

Commissioner Discussion: None.

Public Comments: None.

Commissioner Action: IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER CALL, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BURKHOLDER, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL FOR PA-01-26 THROUGH PA-07-26.

All in Favor, Motion Passed 5-0

B. Z-26-26 HAMBURG TOWNSHIP, TEXT AMENDMENTS
SECTION 36-170 SPECIFIC USE REGULATIONS-HUMAN CREMATORIUMS

The Hamburg Township Planning Commission is proposing to amend their Zoning Ordinance to include new language regarding Human Crematoriums. The Township proposes permitting human crematoriums in the General Industrial District as an accessory use to funeral homes.

DRAFT

Township Recommendation: APPROVAL. The Hamburg Township Planning Commission recommended approval at their August 20, 2026, meeting. A funeral home director spoke in support of the proposed ordinance.

Staff Recommendation: APPROVAL. The proposed ordinance amendment has been thoroughly reviewed. Prior to final adoption the Township should consider all suggestions in the staff's review. The proposed language is appropriate, crematories are compatible with other uses in the General Industrial District.

Commissioner Discussion: Commissioner Burkholder asked about what districts funeral homes are usually permitted.

Public Comments: None.

Commissioner Action: IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER BOWDOIN, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BURKHOLDER, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL.

All in Favor, Motion Passed 5-0

C. Z-27-26 (A) OCEOLA TOWNSHIP, TEXT AMENDMENTS SECTION 13.08 PERMANENT SIGNS PERMITTED IN THE AR DISTRICT

Description: The Oceola Township Planning Commission proposes to amend the township zoning ordinance by removing contradictory language that currently prohibits internal illumination and electronic messaging in the AR District. Each of the ordinance sections being affected is provided below (13.06 & 13.08).

Township Recommendation: APPROVAL.

Staff Recommendation: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS

Staff recommends Approval with Conditions of the proposed amendment to Section 13.08 concerning internal illumination and electronic messaging in the AR District.

The proposed amendment addresses an existing internal inconsistency in the Zoning Ordinance. Section 13.06 currently permits internal illumination and electronic message signs in the AR District, while Section 13.08 prohibits those same features for non-residential and non-agricultural uses. The proposed amendment would remove the prohibition in Section 13.08 and allow the existing Section 13.06 standards to govern.
Approval is recommended subject to the following conditions:

1. Correct the freestanding-sign setback measurement. Section 13.08.2.B.4 currently identifies the required setback as "4 square feet." The intended setback and correct unit of measurement should be confirmed and corrected before adoption.

2. Consider whether the five-second message-change interval is appropriate in the AR District. Section 13.06 currently permits electronic messages to change every five seconds. Because much of the AR District has a lower-intensity development character, the Township may wish to determine whether a longer static-display period would better support its traffic-safety and rural-character objectives.

Commissioner Discussion: Commissioner Ikle asked about regulatory agencies for electric signs.

Public Comments: None.

DRAFT

Commissioner Action: IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER CALL, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER GALBRAITH, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL.

All in Favor, Motion Passed 5-0

Z-27-26 (B) OCEOLA TOWNSHIP, TEXT AMENDMENTS
SECTION 12.20: PRIVATE ROAD STANDARDS

Description: The proposed amendments will make the following substantive changes that accomplish the following:

- Require all new private roads to be approved only through a PUD process.
- Modify right-of-way, pavement width, and surface standards.
- Strengthen connectivity requirements (stub streets, reserved ROW, mandatory connection)
- Update utility easement widths.
- Revise shared access/maintenance rules.
- Replace entire Section 12.20 approval procedures with references to PUD processes.

Township Recommendation: APPROVAL.

Staff Recommendation: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS

County Planning Staff recommends Approval with Conditions of the proposed Private Road Standards amendments. The proposed revisions address several important planning objectives, including improved road design, long-term maintenance, coordinated circulation, future connectivity, and clearer development standards. The proposed graduated road standards also provide greater specificity regarding right-of-way width, roadway surface width, and pavement requirements based upon the number and type of uses served.

Approval is recommended subject to the following conditions:

Revise the private road maintenance provisions addressing future development. The proposed requirement that undeveloped properties participate based upon the maximum number of lots that could potentially be created may be difficult to administer over time.

Consider establishing a mechanism whereby future parcels enter the maintenance agreement and assume an equitable share when access or development approval is actually obtained. Township Attorney review of provisions affecting parcels outside the current development application is also recommended.

Clarify Livingston County Road Commission jurisdiction. Consider adding language stating that Township approval does not replace or supersede applicable Livingston County Road Commission permits, standards, or approvals for intersections with county roads or work within county road rights-of-way. The proposed ordinance already appropriately recognizes LCRC review of sight distance at county road intersections.

Obtain emergency-service review. If not already done so, the applicable fire and emergency-service providers should be given an opportunity to review roadway widths, pavement standards, grades, turning areas, cul-de-sac design, and year-round emergency access before adoption.

Clarify applicability to existing development. The ordinance should identify how the amended standards apply to existing private roads, previously approved developments, extensions of existing roads, existing maintenance agreements, and modifications to previously approved projects.

DRAFT

Coordinate flag-lot provisions with the final private road standards. Any revisions to maintenance-agreement requirements in Section 12.20 should be carried through consistently to the proposed flag-lot maintenance provisions. The Development Standards amendment specifically proposes applying the private-road maintenance agreement requirements to flag-lot drives.

Subject to these revisions and a final technical review of Section 12.20, the proposed Private Road Standards would strengthen the Township's ability to address the long-term design, operation, and maintenance of private-road developments.

Commissioner Discussion: Commissioner Call-under G.1. Private Road Maintenance Agreement, who are they going to record it with? Who inspects need more specifics. It was pointed out that this issue is addressed in a later case being reviewed (Z-27-26 E, Section 12.23.2). Engineering standards for the private road, 66-foot ROW are good ideas. Commissioner Bowdoin: Really design standards having paved surface, land division act. Five (5) or more dwelling units would probably slow traffic. Should be required that besides recording with register of deeds, there should be a copy placed in the Township office. Who will inspect the private road – need specifics.

Public Comments: None.

Commissioner Action: IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER BOWDOIN, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER CALL, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS (PER STAFF REVIEW).

All in Favor, Motion Passed 5-0

Z-27-26 (C) OCEOLA TOWNSHIP, TEXT AMENDMENTS
SECTIONS 7.02, 8.02, 9.02, 12.20: REQUIREMENT FOR PUD APPROVAL FOR PRIVATE ROADS

Description: The proposed amendments will make the following substantive changes that accomplish the following:

- Require PUD approval for any development proposing private roads
- Allow Township Board discretion on forming RPUD committees
- Require Site Plan Approval for land divisions involving ≥5 lots
- Add maintenance agreement requirement for flag lot drives

Township Recommendation: APPROVAL.

Staff Recommendation: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS.

County Planning Staff recommends **Approval with Conditions** of the proposed PUD amendments. The amendments generally support the Township's stated objectives of providing coordinated review of developments involving private road systems and addressing site design, infrastructure planning, open space coordination, and long-term development governance. The proposed residential, commercial, and industrial PUD provisions identify private road systems serving multiple lots or uses as the principal internal circulation system as the basis for requiring PUD review.

Approval is recommended subject to the following conditions:

Clarify the threshold for mandatory PUD review. The language should consistently identify the type and scale of private road development requiring RPUD, CPUD, or IPUD approval. The more specific standard referring to a *system of private roads serving multiple lots, dwelling units, or businesses as the primary internal circulation system* should be reconciled with the broader language in Section 12.20 applying to any development containing a new internal private road.

Clarify the relationship between PUD and Site Plan Approval. Because the existing ordinance already requires Site Plan Approval for uses within an RPUD, CPUD, or IPUD, the amendment should clearly identify whether these are intended to constitute one coordinated review or separate sequential approvals.

Correct the RPUD Study Committee procedure. If formation of the RPUD Study Committee is changed from mandatory to discretionary, the remaining language requiring a committee recommendation before an application can proceed should also be revised. The ordinance should clearly establish the process when the Township Board elects not to appoint a committee.

Clarify the proposed Site Plan Approval threshold for land divisions. The amendment materials alternately refer to "5 or more" lot splits and "more than five" simultaneous splits. The intended threshold should be clearly established and used consistently.

Obtain Township Attorney review of the land-division/site-plan provision. From a planning and ordinance-administration standpoint, the Township should confirm the relationship between the proposed Site Plan Approval requirement and the applicable land-division process before final adoption.

Subject to these revisions, the proposed PUD amendments represent a reasonable approach to providing coordinated review of developments involving substantial private infrastructure and road systems.

Commissioner Discussion: None

Public Comments: None.

Commissioner Action: IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER BOWDOIN, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BURKHOLDER, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS (PER STAFF REVIEW).

All in Favor, Motion Passed 5-0

Z-27-26 (D) OCEOLA TOWNSHIP, TEXT AMENDMENTS
SECTION 7.18: MAKING RPUD COMMITTEES OPTIONAL

Description: The proposed amendment proposes to remove the mandatory or required "shall" verbiage to a more permissive or optional, "may" verbiage.

Township Recommendation: APPROVAL.

Staff Recommendation: APPROVAL. County Planning Staff recommends Approval and supports the amendment to make RPUD Study Committees optional rather than mandatory. This change reflects current Township practice and provides needed flexibility to match the level of review to the complexity of each RPUD proposal. For smaller or straightforward developments, eliminating the requirement to form a committee streamlines the RPUD process, reduces administrative burden, and shortens review timelines. For larger, more complex, or more impactful proposals, the Township Board would still have the discretion to form an ad-hoc committee when detailed plan refinement and multi-agency coordination are appropriate.

Staff also recommends developing informal internal guidance to clarify when committee formation is advisable, ensuring consistency and predictability for applicants. Additionally, because this change alters procedural language, staff advises legal counsel review to confirm that making committees optional does not inadvertently conflict with other mandatory steps or approval sequences within Article 7.

Commissioner Discussion: Commissioner Call: problem with committee, quorum of planning commission could be established if the committee consists of Trustee + Planning Commission Representative (Ex-officio) There needs to be a provision added the excludes the Ex-officio member, such as: "Excepting the Ex-officio member".

Public Comments: None.

Commissioner Action: IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER CALL, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BOWDOIN, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL .

All in Favor, Motion Passed 5-0

Z-27-26 (E) OCEOLA TOWNSHIP, TEXT AMENDMENTS
SECTION 12.23.2: FRONT YARD ACCESSORY STRUCTURES AND MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT FOR FLAG LOT DRIVES

Description: The proposed amendment proposes to require a maintenance agreement prior to the construction of a flag lot.

Township Recommendation: APPROVAL.

Staff Recommendation: APPROVAL. Staff recommends Approval of the proposed amendment, requiring recorded maintenance agreements for all flag lot drives. This requirement strengthens long-term access reliability, ensures equitable cost-sharing among all benefitting properties, and applies a consistent regulatory framework by aligning flag lot drive obligations with the existing private road **maintenance standards** in Section 12.20.H. Because these agreements must be enforceable over time and run with the land, staff further recommends that Township legal counsel review the template agreement language to confirm clarity, proper allocation of responsibilities, and consistency with Township standards.

Commissioner Discussion: Commissioner Call asked how this could impact other sections of the ordinance.

Public Comments: None.

Commissioner Action: IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER BURKHOLDER, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER GALBRAITH, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL.

All in Favor, Motion Passed 5-0

Z-27-26 (F) OCEOLA TOWNSHIP, TEXT AMENDMENTS
SECTION 16.01: SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR 5 OR MORE LOT SPLITS

Description: The proposed amendment proposes to revise the requirements for an application for site plan approval.

Township Recommendation: APPROVAL.

Staff recommends supporting the amendment requiring Site Plan Approval for applications proposing five or more simultaneous lot splits. This change maintains Oceola Township's existing review practice and preserves appropriate oversight for larger land divisions, especially given recent changes to the Land Division Act that would otherwise allow such splits without a subdivision or site condominium process. Requiring Site Plan

Approval ensures that infrastructure impacts, access, drainage, utility capacity, and compliance with the Township Master Plan are properly evaluated before development proceeds.

Because this amendment asserts local review authority under a revised state framework, staff also recommends Township legal counsel review to confirm that the Site Plan requirement is fully enforceable and consistent with the amended Land Division Act.

Commissioner Discussion: None.

Public Comments: None.

Commissioner Action: IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER CALL, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BOWDOIN, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL.

All in Favor, Motion Passed 5-0

D. Z-28-26 HOWELL TOWNSHIP, REZONING

SECTION 21
Current Zoning: Industrial Flex Zone
Proposed Zoning: Neighborhood Service Commercial
Section: 21

The subject parcel is master planned as industrial flex which is intended to allow for a wide range of commercial and industrial uses whereas the NSC future land use classification is primarily for local commercial uses that are smaller in scale such as retail, personal service establishments, small offices, and local contractor facilities that are intended to service immediate areas and not create nuisances. The location of the proposed rezoning is the primary driver that makes the NSC zoning an appropriate choice at the given location. A gas station and convenience store location is suited well for a high visibility intersection and would blend well with existing uses along this section of Grand River Avenue. While the subject parcel is future planned as industrial flex, the rezoning to NSC is compatible with the overall goals and policies of the Howell Township Master Plan and is supported by the Livingston County Master Plan.

Township Recommendation: APPROVAL. The proposed rezoning was approved at the August 25, 2026, public hearing. There was discussion at the planning commission meeting on the proposed rezoning and if it was appropriate for the area.

Staff Recommendation: APPROVAL. The proposed rezoning from IFZ to NSC is compatible with the overall goals and policies of the Howell Township Master Plan and the Livingston County Master Plan.

Commissioner Discussion: Commissioner Call and Commissioner Bowdoin commented that the rezoning was not consistent with the Master Plan.

Public Comments: None.

Commissioner Action: IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER BOWDOIN, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER CALL, TO RECOMMEND DISAPPROVAL DUE TO THE REZONING BEING INCONSISTENT WITH THE TOWNSHIP MASTER PLAN.

All in Favor, Motion Passed 5-0

DRAFT

8. OLD BUINESS: None.

9. NEW BUSINESS: None.

10. REPORTS: None.

11. COMMISSIONERS HEARD AND CALL TO THE PUBLIC: Commissioner Ikle recognized Commissioner Burkholder and her service to the Planning Commission.

12. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Action: MOTION BY COMMISSIONER BURKHOLDER, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BOWDOIN, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT: 7:31 P.M.

All in Favor, Motion Passed

DRAFT