

Trustees
Carol J. Burkard
Scott Ruggles
Andrea C. Voorheis
Rik Kowall

## WHITE LAKE TOWNSHIP

7525 Highland Road • White Lake, Michigan 48383-2900 • (248) 698-3300 • www.whitelaketwp.com

# WHITE LAKE TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting 7525 Highland Road White Lake, MI 48383 February 4, 2016 @ 7:00 p.m.

Ms. Novak-Phelps called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Roll was called: Mr. Lewsley and Mr. Meagher were excused.

 ROLL CALL:

Steve Anderson - Vice Chairperson

Merrie Carlock

Debby Dehart - Secretary

Mark Fine Rhonda Grubb

Rik Kowall, Board Liaison David Lewsley - Excused Peter Meagher - Excused

Gail Novak-Phelps - Chairperson

Also Present:

Sean O'Neil, AICP, Community Development Director

Lynn Hinton, Recording Secretary

Visitors:

**Approval of Agenda** 

Mr. Kowall moved to approve the agenda as presented. Mr. Anderson supported and the MOTION CARRIED with a voice vote. (7 yes votes)

## **Approval of Minutes**

a. January 7, 2016

Mr. Kowall moved to approve the minutes of January 7, 2016 as submitted. Mr. Anderson supported and the MOTION CARRIED with a voice vote. (7 yes votes)

Call to the Public (for items not on the agenda)

Ms. Novak-Phelps opened the discussion for public comment on items not listed on the agenda, but none was offered.

## **Public Hearing:**

a. Draft Amendments to Zoning Ordinance 58 – amend Section 2.2 Definitions, amend Section 5.4 Substandard Lots, amend Section 5.7 Accessory Structures in Residential Districts, amend Section 5.9 Signs, amend Section 6.8.B Required Contents for Site Plan Drawings, amend Section 7.27 Nonconforming Lots

 Mr. O'Neil indicated that he heard from the Township Clerk, Mr. Lilley, who recommended discussion on a few items. With regard to display addresses, the ordinance requires a minimum of 6" in height. Mr. Lilley is suggesting a minimum of 12". He feels commercial and industrial properties should have 12".

Mr. Kowall feels 6" is adequate, and that is the standard sign font height. His concern would be with single use signs. Those applications would make the sign way too high if 12" figures were required. Also, 6" numbers are clearly visible if they are contrasted in color.

Ms. Carlock asked whether the numbers would take away from the overall signage space. Mr. O'Neil stated that they do not.

Ms. Novak-Phelps suggested that the commission could address this on a case-by-case basis if a project came in as a PD and wanted a larger size.

Mr. O'Neil will consult with the Police and Fire departments to see if they feel 6" is adequate. Mr. Kowall noted that emergency numbers in the Fire Department call for 4", which is the national standard.

With regard to accessory structures, Mr. Lilly is concerned with vacant lots, or back lots, where people may keep a boat, but are putting sheds on these lots, where there is not a BOCA or permit issue. He asked whether we wanted to further regulate this down to a certain size. Currently, there is no limit on an accessory structure if it meets the required setbacks and sheds below 200 sq. ft. do not need a permit. This may be more of an enforcement issue.

Mr. Anderson feels this would be adding another requirement for someone to evaluate. The way the ordinance reads now, it is an acceptable blanket statement. He doesn't want to see something defined that needs further interpretation. We want to make clear that we are enforcing that accessory buildings meet the required setbacks.

Regarding Page 3, Section 5.7(c), it currently reads for the SF Suburban Farms district. Mr. O'Neil asked for thoughts on adding AG Agriculture to this, and adding the word "conforming".

Mr. Kowall noted that previously, the township made a major change in the definition of SF from 1 acre to 2 acres. This is not fair and equitable for someone that has 1 acre. He would like to keep this section as SF and AG, but not add the "conforming".

Ms. Dehart agrees that we should not limit this to "conforming". Some developments are older SF with one acre and have been there for many years. It wouldn't be fair to limit them.

Mr. Fine agrees to add AG but not the word "conforming".

Ms. Novak-Phelps opened the public hearing 7:23 p.m.

Mike Long, 1209 Pinecrest, is in favor of adding AG in the section with SF as an exception because of horse farms. Mr. Long also referenced Section 5.7(c) where it states that accessory walls shall not exceed 14 ft., with the total height not to exceed 18 ft. He noted that a 412 pitch would exceed the 18 ft. total height, and the middle of roof would be at 20 ft. The way it's written states not to exceed total building height. This could be amended to say from the middle of roof.

Mr. O'Neill will revise the wording and drop the word "total" from the verbage.

There was more discussion regarding SF and AG properties as they pertain to section 5.7. Ms. Dehart brought up indoor arenas for horses and the size of the property needed to have one. Mr. O'Neil will also reword this section to put in a 5 acre minimum requirement and also omit the wording "and in no case".

Mr. Long asked for clarification on post-pilon signs from Section 5.9. It reads that the sign can only be 4 ft. and he questioned whether this was correct. Mr. O'Neil stated that it is correct. Mr. Long then stated he also agrees with the 6" numbers discussed earlier.

With no other comments, the public hearing was closed at 7:42 p.m.

118 119 120

121

122

Mr. Kowall made a motion to move the proposed ordinance amendments, including the discussion tonight, to the Township Board for consideration. Ms. Grubb supported and the MOTION CARRIED with a roll call vote: Grubb - yes; Kowall - yes; Novak-Phelps - yes; Anderson - yes; Fine -yes; Carlock - yes; Dehart - yes. (7 yes votes)

123 124 125

## Liaison's Report

126 127

128

129

130 131

132

Ms. Grubb reported that the committee talked about submitting 2 grant applications for Hidden Pines Park and a TAP Bogie Lake Pathway. They held a public hearing for Hidden Pines, some of the comments were to install more fencing, and putting an enclosure around the porta potty. The committee did not see a problem with taking care of this in the spring. They also thought there may be damage to the benches, but after a visit from township maintenance personnel, no damage was found. The residents present also appreciated the park being there. A concern from another resident was with "no parking" signage on the private road. He is concerned people will park there.

133 134 135

136 137

138

139 140

Mr. Kowall reported the Board had a full house at the last meeting. Twenty-five paid on-call firefighters were sworn in. The Board saw a Fire Safety Education Demo, which he thought was very cool. It was set up Jeopardy-style for grade school children. They had a 2<sup>nd</sup> reading of the amended Chapter 38 Water System Ordinance, and the pay schedule was reviewed. White Lake Township will have a program at the Dublin Center for cognitively impaired teens and adults. This will act as a social network. There is no format yet, but the Board unanimously approved the concept. There was a briefing by Mr. Powell, who indicated he is still gathering information on the pathway project. He attended the MTA on January 20-23. There were many good topics discussed.

142 143 144

141

Ms. Novak-Phelps reported that the ZBA had one item, and approved variances on a non-conforming property. There were many challenges with the site. There will be future ZBA training at the request of the ZBA.

146 147 148

145

## Consultant's Report

**Director's Report** 

149 150

## None

151 152 153

154

155

156 157 Mr. O'Neil reported Cedar Meadows and Modern Messages are getting ready to resubmit for final, and Kroger is progressing. The Master Plan must be reviewed every 5 years and 2016 is the 5<sup>th</sup> year. It was completely overhauled in 2011. We have a fantastic plan that may just need to be tweeked a little. Most can be done internally. He asked for feedback on the computers and the consensus was that the group liked them.

158 159

## Communications:

Adjournment

160 161 162

## Next meeting dates:

163 164

Regular Meeting – February 18, 2016 – possible cancellation

165

Regular Meeting – March 3, 2016

166 167 168

The meeting was adjourned at 8:04 p.m. with a voice vote. (7 yes votes)