

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MONITOR  
REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
September 1, 2015

The meeting was called to order by Chairman J. Bellor at 7:00 p.m.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Members present: E. Arnold, J. Bellor, R.. Campbell, D. Darland, C. Hoyle, M. Morin

Members absent: J. Frank

Also present: R. Sheppard, Planning Attorney; P. Lippens, Planner

**Motion by C. Hoyle seconded by R. Campbell to adopt the agenda with the addition of a memo for Communications from the Supervisor requesting sign review during site plan review.**

Motion carried.

**Motion by C. Hoyle seconded by M. Morin to approve the minutes of the August 5, 2015 regular meeting as presented.**

Motion carried.

**Public Input**

Chairman Bellor opened and closed public comment at 7:05 p.m. with no one present to speak.

**Items for Consideration**

Wilder/Euclid Access Management Plan

Attorney Sheppard reviewed the Township Board action regarding a previous access plan for M-13/Wilder Rd.

Much discussion regarding the need for traffic impact studies, driveway spacing. The existing study is a recommendation. There is a question whether the Township wants to be the enforcer for MDOT.

Planner Lippens will put a maximum of two hours into putting a memo together and E. Arnold will check with the Township Board regarding implementation. Planner Lippens will review the MDOT standards to see if they are consistent with best practices for corridor design and that they support the kind of development that the township wants.

Zoning Audit Review

Planner Lippens distributed a revised tentative schedule for reviewing Ordinance 52.

Fence issues: Barbed wire, rear yards in Commercial. P. Lippens marked all locations in ordinances referring to fences. R. Sheppard reviewed some of the issues with the previous fence proposal that was denied by the Board.

Residential fences--permit? surveys? E. Arnold noted that the fence at Bayfield Assisted Living is not on a site plan. Fire department access. P. Lippens will find the previous proposed ordinance and see if conflicts can be eliminated..

Height Regulations: Do we increase the height limit? J. Bellor mentioned Fire Department concern for access and availability of higher ladders. Does the Board want to depend on Mutual Aid? Look at the conditions set forth for special permission that was set for the Bay City Times (Herald) building. A letter from the fire chief with his opinion is desired before making any changes.

Pond issues: Clarifying what is required for Permit. Sec.3.32 limits ponds to one acre or 5% of the total ground surface area of the parcel, whichever is smaller, with no permit or site plan needed. Sec. 3.33ff set site plan and variance requirements. Slopes are an issue.

Temporary uses and Tent Sales: A new area for regulation? Permit needed? It is suggested that anything longer than three days should be reviewed by Planning Commission, e.g. car dealership sales.

Kawkawlin District Regulations: Should Kawkawlin have its own zoning district? Some issues were addressed with the homes on small lots amendment (52-V). Due to its unique nature, Kawkawlin needs to have its own set of requirements.

Non-motorized Vehicles: Support Complete Streets, Sidewalks, Commercial vs. Residential. Include sidewalks in new subdivisions and in the Euclid/Wilder Commercial District.

Permitted Uses and Special Land Uses by District: Combine some items on the list of uses/definitions--(Dress shop/Card shop/ music store) Retail. The same is true in the industrial zone. Are there new uses that should be added?

Signs: Sign approval should be included with site plan review.. Signs now are required to be Content Neutral. Political signs, Real Estate signs. Lots of discussion.

The Planner noted that Kerkau is allowed a monument sign even though it is more of a way-finding. No pole signs are allowed because the district doesn't permit it. If their wall sign was 50% smaller, it would be fine. P. Lippens noted that in the Commercial District they are allowed to do way-finding signs.

Attorney Sheppard isn't sure that we can review signs with site plan review because most people don't have it ready then. Planner Lippens explained that Kerkau was allowed to have a 100 sq. ft. monument sign anywhere on the property. Because the lot is on a corner giving them two frontages, they are allowed two wall signs totaling not more than 150% of their allotment. They can't have any of the other signs. The directional signs aren't bad to have since it is a big campus, but they aren't allowed.

Because the present permitting process doesn't seem to be working for signs, the recommendation is for signs to be on the original site plan. If they don't have that information available at the time of

site plan review, they will have to come back with their sign plans and pay another review fee before a building permit is issued.

E. Arnold questioned Uno's LED sign which was placed on a non-conforming sign and two signs were put up instead of one.

Non-Conforming regulations: Some have been fixed, like allowing non-conforming homes to rebuild.

One current issue is a barn that needs wood replaced and that isn't allowed because it is a non-conforming structure. The ordinance in Sec. 16.08 states that a non-conforming structure may only be repaired if it has been damaged by fire, wind, snow, Acts of God, etc. Much discussion. Residents may *maintain* their non-conforming structures.

### **Reports**

Planner Lippens noted a couple of requirements that still need to be met by Dollar General: 1) the need for a driveway easement, 2) spelling corrections, 3) Fire Department issues.

### **Communications**

**Motion by R. Campbell supported by M. Morin to accept Communications. Motion carried.**

**Motion by C. Hoyle supported by R. Campbell to adjourn.  
Motion carried.**

Meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Darland  
Secretary

DD/jw