

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF GARFIELD
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Wednesday, March 23, 2016 @ 7:00 pm
Garfield Township Hall
3848 Veterans Drive
Traverse City, MI 49684
Ph: (231) 941-1620

A G E N D A

Call Meeting to Order

Roll Call of Commission Members

1. Review and Approval of the Agenda - Conflict of Interest
2. Minutes
March 9, 2016
3. Correspondence
4. Reports
 - a. Township Board
 - b. Planning Commissioners
5. Business to Come Before the Commission
 - a. PD 2016- 26 – Proposed Amendments to Zoning Ordinance #68
6. Public Comment
7. Items for Next Agenda – April 13, 2016
 - a. Kings Court – Request to Rezone – Public Hearing
 - b. LaFranier – Request to Rezone – Public Hearing
 - c. Proposed Amendments to Zoning Ordinance # 68 – Public Hearing
8. Adjournment

Joe Robertson, Secretary
Garfield Township Planning Commission
3848 Veterans Drive
Traverse City, MI 49684

Garfield Township will provide necessary reasonable auxiliary aids and services, such as signers for hearing impaired and audio tapes of printed materials being considered at the meeting to individuals with disabilities upon the provision of reasonable advance notice to Garfield Township. Individuals with disabilities requiring auxiliary aids or services should contact Garfield Township by writing or calling Lanie McManus, Clerk, Ph: (231) 941-1620, or TDD #922

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF GARFIELD
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
March 9, 2016**

Call Meeting to Order: Chair Racine called the meeting to order at 7:00pm at the Garfield Township Hall, 3848 Veterans Drive, Traverse City, MI 49684.

Roll Call of Commission Members:

Present: Kit Wilson, Terry Clark, Gil Uithol, John Nelson, Pat Cline, Joe Robertson, and John Racine

Staff Present: Rob Larrea

1. Review and Approval of the Agenda – Conflict of Interest (7:00)

Uithol moved and Robertson seconded to approve the agenda as presented.

Ayes: Uithol, Robertson, Clark, Nelson, Wilson, Cline, Racine

Nays: None

2. Minutes (7:01)

a. February 10, 2016 Minutes

Clark moved and Wilson seconded to approve the minutes of February 10, 2016 as amended placing the comment under item 7 to a new item called "Other Business."

Ayes: Clark, Wilson, Nelson, Cline, Robertson, Uithol, Racine

Nays: None

3. Correspondence (7:03)

None

4. Reports (7:02)

Township Board Report

Wilson had no report.

Planning Commissioners

No reports

5. Business to Come Before the Commission

a. PD 2016-20 Kings Court – Request to Rezone (7:03)

The application requests to rezone approximately 37 acres of land from the A- Agricultural District to the R-M Mobile Home Residential District. The application affects two properties located to the North of Lloyd Lane, to the west of LaFranier Road and to the east of Keystone Road. One parcel is already partially zoned R-M and is the site of the existing King's Court manufactured home park. The other parcel is vacant except for a single family home which exists on the south side of the site. Larrea stated that the Master Plan identifies the parcels as Planned Development

Residential. Bob Shmude representing Sun Communities, said that they wish to expand King's Court Mobile Home Community. They wish to connect to the existing sewer and water and are working with the Township Engineer on the matter. The plan calls for 158 sites which works out to 4 units per acre. The sites will be larger and able to house a double wide manufactured home with ease as well as allowing for some open space on the proposed site. Commissioners commented on the location and expansion of the project in that area.

Uithol moved and Clark seconded THAT application Z-2016-02, submitted by Atwell, LLC to rezone portions of parcel 05-023-027-00 and all of parcel 05-023-032-00 from the A Agricultural District to the R-M Mobile Home Residential District, BE ACCEPTED; and further

THAT application Z-2016-02 be scheduled for public hearing at the regular meeting of the Garfield Township Planning Commission to be held on April 13, 2016, subject to the applicant providing sealed site surveys to the satisfaction of the Planning Department in advance of publication of the legal notice.

*Yeas: Uithol, Clark, Wilson, Robertson, Nelson, Cline, Racine
Nays: None*

b. PD 2016-21 LaFranier – Request to Rezone (7:12)

The subject property is located at the northwest corner of Garfield and Hammond Roads and is currently vacant. The portion proposed for rezoning is approximately 19 acres of a 76 acre parcel. Property to the north is zoned A-1 Agricultural, property to the east is zoned R-3 Multi-family; to the south C-L Local Commercial and to the west is vacant A-Agricultural. The application proposes to rezone a portion of the property from A- Agricultural to C-G General Commercial, without restriction. Scott Jozwiak representing owner Dixie Roethlisberger, said that there were no plans for development yet. Jozwiak added that the portion being rezoned is suitable for building as it is a higher elevation than the wetlands to the south and west. He is aware that a service drive will need to be installed and will be sure to work out the details with any new owner. Larrea added that the Master Plan shows the property as Planned Commercial and commissioners discussed that a PUD would be perfect for the site.

Nelson moved Robertson supported THAT application Z-2016-01, submitted by Dixie Roethlisberger on behalf of LaFranier Louis & Marvel R. Trust, to rezone lands along Hammond and Garfield Roads from the current A- Agriculture to the C-G General Commercial District, BE ACCEPTED; and further

THAT application Z-2016-01 be scheduled for public hearing at the regular meeting of the Garfield Township Planning Commission to be held on April 13, 2016.

Yeas: Nelson, Robertson, Cline, Wilson, Nelson, Clark, Racine
Nays: None

7. **Public Comment (7:27)**

None


8. **Items for Next Agenda – March 23, 2016**

a. **To be determined**

9. **Adjournment**

Nelson moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:29pm.

Joe Robertson, Secretary
Garfield Township Planning
Commission
3848 Veterans Drive
Traverse City, MI 49684

 Charter Township of Garfield Planning Department Report No. PD 2016-26			
Prepared:	March 16, 2016	Pages:	1 of 3
Meeting:	March 23, 2016 Planning Commission	Attachments:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Subject:	C-P Shopping Center Signs; Accessory Buildings in Agricultural District		

STAFF COMMENT:

This report is intended to present zoning ordinance amendments for the Planning Commission's consideration and to potentially schedule the first public hearing on the changes for April 27, 2016.

The proposed amendments are as follows:

Proposed amendment to Planned Shopping Center Sign Requirements.

The Planning Commission has the authority to review and decide on sign requests in the C-P Planned Shopping Center District. Currently, this section reads in its entirety as follows:

G. Signs Permitted in C-P Planned Shopping Center Commercial Districts:

In the C-P District signs shall be designed as an integral part of the planned shopping center development and shall be approved by the Planning Commission. Signs advertising or identifying the owner or occupant of a given building or portion thereof shall be placed on the structure of the building or business itself. Other signs along roadways, etc. shall be directional and identify the center only and not the individual occupants.

While the above requirement reflects the intent, it does not give the Planning Commission or applicant a true standard for approval or denial of a request. Based in part on this ambiguity, and also because of a recent ZBA case which authorized signs not normally allowed and potentially set negative precedent, it is recommended to revise this section. Staff (with the assistance of legal counsel) has prepared the following proposed amendment:

DRAFT Section 630

G. Signs Permitted in C-P Planned Shopping Center Commercial Districts:

In the C-P District the following signs shall be permitted:

- (1) Signs permitted as of right.
 - (a) One wall sign is permitted per exterior storefront. Tenants occupying corner spaces may utilize one sign per elevation with a maximum of two signs. The maximum wall sign area shall be the lesser of 100 square feet or 20% of the area to which the sign is attached.
 - (b) One 100 square foot freestanding sign is permitted per public roadway that the development fronts on.
- (2) Any proposed sign(s) not meeting the standards in Paragraph (1) above may be approved by the Planning Commission if the Planning Commission determines that all of the following standards are met:

- (a) The proposed sign(s) shall be designed as an integral part of the development, with letter size and location proportional to the overall design.
 - (b) The Planning Commission determines that the maximum sign standards of the C-P district do not provide for the reasonable use of the planned shopping center.
 - (c) The proposed sign(s) is (are) appropriate for the site, compatible with surrounding land uses, and necessary for the reasonable use of the planned shopping center.
 - (d) The permitted sign(s) is (are), in the determination of the Planning Commission, the minimum increase(s) necessary to ensure that the proposed sign(s) is appropriate in scale, bulk and location relative to the site and surrounding land uses.
 - (e) All approved modifications from the required sign standards shall be specific to the sign(s) approved by the Planning Commission.
- (3) The following signs are Prohibited in the C-P District (and may not be approved by the Planning Commission pursuant to paragraph (2) above):
- (a) All signs described in §630.P.
 - (b) Cabinet signs.
 - (c) Changeable copy signs and Billboard signs.
 - (d) Signs with exposed neon or other exposed lighting source.

In addition, a new definition of "exterior storefront" becomes necessary:

Exterior storefront. A building wall and entryway which provides direct public access to a tenant's retail space from outside of the overall structure.

The above draft describes signs which will be routinely allowed "as of right." These regulations are written to reflect what is normally allowed in the C-G General Commercial District. However, the standard also gives the Planning Commission the ability to increase these standards should it feel appropriate, but with standards to rely on in making a decision. (Note: these standards closely reflect PUD sign approvals.)

Proposed Amendment to section 611 Accessory Uses and Structures

When the new zoning ordinance was adopted, it carried over size limitations for accessory buildings in the residential and agricultural zoning districts. Namely, the total amount of accessory building square footage could not exceed the size of the home on the property on all residentially zoned properties, or on lots measuring less than 2 acres in the Agricultural District.

Inadvertently, however, the new ordinance did exempt agriculturally zoned parcels larger than 2 acres from this limitation. Therefore, the following amendment is proposed to correct the omission.

Please note: recommended deletions ~~struck through~~, recommended additions **highlight**.

(EXCERPT) SECTION 611 ACCESSORY USES AND STRUCTURES

Accessory uses and structures may be established provided the following standards are met:

A. Regulations and Conditions

- (1) WITHIN ALL DISTRICTS EXCEPT "R-1," "R-2," "R-R" AND "A" DISTRICTS: A use may be regarded as accessory if it is incidental or insubstantial in and of itself or in relation to the principal use. The accessory use or structure shall comply with the various development standards of this ordinance such as setbacks, clear vision areas, landscaping, height, lighting, etc. An accessory use shall not generate any effects on neighboring properties, including, but not limited to, noise, parking, traffic, glare, or dust, greater than or more burdensome than such impacts from the main use on the property.
- (2) WITHIN THE "R-1," "R-2," AND "R-R" AND "A" DISTRICTS: Accessory buildings may be erected as part of the principal building or may be connected to it by a roofed-over porch, patio, breezeway, or similar structure, or they may be completely detached. If attached to the principal building, an accessory building shall be made structurally a part of it, and shall comply in all respects with the requirements applicable to the principal building.

An accessory building not attached and not made a part of the principal building shall be permitted provided that:

- (a) The structure is located a minimum of ten (10) feet from any other separate structure on the same lot;
- (b) The structure meets the minimum side yard setback, is not located in any front yard, does not exceed more than twenty-five percent (25%) of a required rear yard, and is located a minimum of 10-feet from the rear yard property line;
- (c) The structure shall not exceed a size equal to the ground floor area of the principal building and shall not exceed one (1) story or eighteen (18) feet in height; and
- (d) The structure may not be placed closer to the side street lot line than the side yard setback of the principal building on a corner lot.

(3) WITHIN THE "A" AGRICULTURAL DISTRICTS:

- (a) Lots measuring less than two (2) acres: subject to the standards of Paragraph (2), above.
- (b) Lots of two (2) acres or more: subject to the dimensional standards of § 325 A Agricultural (See Attached Dimensional Standards).

ACTION REQUESTED:

Following review and discussion, the Planning Commission is requested to schedule a public hearing on the proposed ordinance amendments for public hearing on April 27, 2016.

Attachments:

Section 325.D Agricultural Dimensional Standards

D. DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS (Per Dwelling Unit):

Minimum Lot Area (A):	43,560 sq. ft.
Minimum Lot Width:	110 feet
Maximum Building Height:	
• In Stories:	2 ½ stories
• In Feet:	35 feet
Minimum Yard Setbacks (B):	
• Front:	30 feet
• Each Side:	20 feet
• Rear:	35 feet
Maximum Lot Coverage:	20 percent
Minimum Bldg. Cross Section:	24 feet

Notes to Dimensional Standards:

- (A) An agricultural operation which includes the raising and keeping of livestock for profit shall have a minimum lot area of ten (10) acres. Individual lot areas in recorded plats may be less than the required minimum provided the average lot size in the recorded plat is not less than the required minimum lot area of the A District and provided further that no individual lot size shall be less than seventy percent (70%) of the minimum required lot area. Provisions for reduced lot shall be stated on the recorded plat such that minimum average lot sizes shall be maintained in the event of any subsequent amendment(s) to the plat. Not more than ten percent (10%) of the total lots in a plat shall contain less than the required minimum lot area.
- (B) Setbacks shall be measured from the furthest protruding point of structure.

