

DRAFT

**SPRING LAKE TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
February 17, 2010 - REGULAR MEETING**

PRESENT: David Rumpel, Dennis Masson, Ronald Lindquist, Jack Ketchum, Greg Latsch
Ross Vlietstra, and Russ Tiles.

ABSENT: None

PARTICIPANTS: Lukas Hill - Community Development Director

A. Call to Order.

Rumpel called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

B. Adoption of Minutes.

Masson moved to adopt the minutes as presented of the January 20, 2010 regular meeting of the Planning Commission. The motion was seconded by Vlietstra, which passed unanimously.

C. Approval of Agenda.

Latch moved to approve the agenda. Ketchum seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

D. General Public Comment: None

E. Draft Zoning Ordinance and Map:

Hill presented a memo to the Planning Commission that highlighted some of the minor changes desired by the Township Board. Hill explained that the Township Board tabled action on the draft zoning ordinance with the following concerns:

1. Allowing duplexes to remain as conforming uses in single family zoning districts is contradictory to the goals of the Master Plan.

Staff Response: Many rural areas of the township were zoned R-2 that allowed both single family and two family homes. The zoning ordinance review committee and Planning Commission agreed to the following points that support this decision of allowing existing duplexes as a permitted uses:

- a. Duplexes should be located in areas with municipal water and sewer.
- b. Duplexes should be limited to high density districts or as part of a PUD.
- c. Existing duplexes are plentiful in the Township and represent a large overall investment. Making them existing non-conforming uses would likely deter the upkeep of the property and create financing problems.
- d. There is no desire to "outlaw" the existing duplexes; however the committee does not want to allow more of them in rural areas without utilities.

DRAFT

- e. The Township Master Plan specifically states to examine zoning districts that allow duplexes. This land use was examined and it was determined that not allowing more duplexes was reasonable and allowing the existing duplexes to remain as legal conforming structures was a fair approach to meeting the goals of the plan.
2. Section 306 J: There was concern that the nine (9) foot height restriction of a pool house was too restrictive. Staff has no concern if the existing language above is put in the existing draft.
3. Section 306 J, 5: Why limit the square footage of a waterfront deck to 144 square feet?
Staff Response: This is a new provision that allows above grade decks on steep slope waterfront lots with the standard 50 foot waterfront setback. The primary purpose is to allow a reasonable “landing space” at the bottom of a bluff near the water’s edge. They are allowed only as a special use to ensure that neighbors have the opportunity to have input. Since this is a new provision that allows a structure within the standard setback, it was decided to keep the number fairly conservative. Large decks can still be constructed within the other required setbacks. Staff does not recommend a change in this language.
4. Section 345 and 347: These two sections are not consistent and should be.
Staff Response: Section 345 deals with the period of time one has to raze a house after a permit has been obtained. In other words, if one pulls a permit today to raze a house, they can start and finish the project at anytime within a six month time period. Typically, this is not a drawn out process as the structure is torn down and removed at the same time when the heavy equipment is on site. Section 347 states that if the structure is DAMAGED beyond repair, it should be razed within 90 days as per Section 345. This situation is different in that the Township desires to see a damaged and unsafe (and likely unappealing) structure removed in 90 days verses allowing it to remain for six months. Therefore, staff does not recommend changing this language.
5. Section 306 J: The height limitation of a pump house (two feet) is too restrictive.
Staff Response: Increasing the maximum height to 3 feet would not be an issue.
6. Section 1303: Are the items in this section required or not? If so, should they be moved to Section 1005, B, for site plan requirements?
Staff Response: Article 13, Sustainable Community Assessment, is not a mandatory requirement and the language in 1303, in that it uses the word “required,” is confusing. Staff simply recommends removing the “required” aspects of the SCA as these aspects are covered in other parts of the SCA and Zoning Ordinance.
7. A request was made to score other developments in the Township as per Article 13, Sustainable Community Assessment, and present at the next Board meeting.
8. What are the primary differences between the Master Plan and Zoning Ordinance?
Staff Response: The primary differences are the planned residential areas in the northwest and southeast are not zoned for higher density at this time as the infrastructure is not present (water and sewer).

The Planning Commission recognized and discussed these concerns however they did not offer any additional comments to the Township Board. They did appreciate the information.

DRAFT

F. SLT DPW Presentation:

Mr. Ron Brondyke and Mr. Jeremy Statler of the Spring Lake Township Dept. of Public Works presented an overview of the municipal water and sewer system. Information including existing infrastructure, future plans, capacity, and maintenance was provided.

G. Commissioner Comments

1. Lindquist gave a report on the latest Township Board activity.
2. No Report
3. No Report

H. Motion to adjourn at 8:15 PM made by Ketchum with support from Lindquist. Motion Passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

Ross Vlietstra, Secretary
Planning Commission