

**Minutes of the regular meeting of the Georgetown Township Planning Commission, held
Wednesday, September 1, 2021**

Meeting called to order by Chairperson Samy at 7:00 p.m.

Present: Jeannine Bolhouse, Donna Ferguson, Michael Moores, Jessica Ulberg, Tom Healy, Gary Veldink, Josiah Samy

Absent: None

Also present: Victor Vuong, Zoning Administrator

#210901-01 – Planning Commission Agenda for September 1, 2021

Moved by Gary Veldink, seconded by Donna Ferguson, to approve the agenda as submitted.

Yeas: Jeannine Bolhouse, Donna Ferguson, Michael Moores, Jessica Ulberg, Tom Healy, Gary Veldink, Josiah Samy

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

#210901-02 – Minutes of the August 18, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting

Moved by Gary Veldink, seconded by Donna Ferguson, to approve the minutes as presented.

Yeas: Jeannine Bolhouse, Donna Ferguson, Michael Moores, Jessica Ulberg, Tom Healy, Gary Veldink

Nays: None

Abstain: Josiah Samy

MOTION CARRIED.

#210901-03 – (PUD2102) Bauer Crossings PUD preliminary development plan and one final development plan, for condominiums and townhouses, along with various amenities, on parcels of land described as P.P. # 70-14-07-100-018 and P.P. # 70-14-07-115-000, located at 48th Ave., Georgetown Township, Ottawa County, MI.

David Stebbins of Redstone Homes presented the request ([application](#)), with the following comments:

- In spring of 2019, they were granted approval for a single assisted living facility with 80 units for the next phase. However, they had no luck in finding anyone to operate the facility so now they are looking at a continuation of phase 1 and 2 by constructing condominiums and a townhouse building. There will also be a maintenance building at the southeast corner of the PUD site so they can have an onsite property manager due to the size of the property. This proposal for the next phase consists of a total of 24 units and a maintenance building. The water main and sanitary sewer are already in the ground so all they have to do is put in the laterals to service the new units. Storm sewer wraps around the units to take it to the detention basins.

The Zoning Administrator presented the [staff report](#).

Josiah Samy said the plan looks great.

Gary Veldink asked are the number of sewer hookups changing?

David Stebbins said they are going from 80 units to 24 units. The Public Works Director told them the laterals cannot be in the rear yard, so the only way to service all the buildings is by putting in a 12-unit townhouse building.

The Chairperson opened the floor to public comments.

No one was present to make public comments at this time.

The Chairperson closed the floor to public comments.

Moved by Donna Ferguson, seconded by Tom Healy, to adopt the staff report as finding of fact and to approve the revised preliminary development plan for (PUD2102) Bauer Crossings PUD, for condominiums, townhouses, along with various amenities, on parcels of land described as P.P. # 70-14-07-100-018 and P.P. # 70-14-07-115-000, located at 48th Ave., Georgetown Township, Ottawa County, Michigan, as shown on the following documents:

- 1. Application and narrative dated August 17, 2021;**
- 2. Sheet No. C-205, Site plan dated 08.16.21;**
- 3. Sheet No. C-300, Grading & Utility plan dated 08.16.21;**
- 4. Sheet No. C-901, Open Space plan dated 08.16.21;**
- 5. Sheet No. L-201, Landscape plan dated 08.16.21;**
- 6. Sheet No. A1.1, Exterior Elevations (4 Unit Ranch Condo) dated 08.24.17;**
- 7. Sheet No. 1/8, Front Elevation (6 Unit Condominium) dated 08.27.18;**
- 8. Sheet 1 of 2, Maintenance Barn (Elevations) dated 07.07.21**

Based on the determinations that:

- 1. The proposal is consistent with the Master Plan.**
- 2. The proposal meets the ordinance requirement for pedestrian walkways.**
- 3. The proposal meets the ordinance requirement for architecture.**
- 4. The proposal meets the ordinance requirement for traffic.**
- 5. The proposal meets the ordinance requirement for open space.**
- 6. The proposal meets the ordinance requirement for uses that are allowed.**
- 7. The proposal meets the standards of approval.**

Based on the findings that:

- 1. The qualifying conditions in Sec. 22.2 are met:**
- 2. The information as per Sec. 22.5 is provided, and**
- 3. The plan meets the ordinance requirements of Sec. 22.10 as follows:**
 - a. The qualifying conditions in Sec. 22.2 are met;**
 - b. The proposed PUD is compatible with surrounding uses of land, the natural environment, and the capacities of public services and facilities affected by the development;**

- c. **The proposed uses within the PUD will not possess conditions or effects that would be injurious to the public health, safety, or welfare of the community;**
- d. **The proposed project is consistent with the spirit and intent of the PUD District, as described in Section 22.1 and represents an opportunity for improved or innovative development for the community that could not be achieved through conventional zoning;**
- e. **The proposed PUD meets all the site plan requirements of Chapter 22 including Section 22.8, D;**
- f. **The deviations, regulatory modification from traditional district requirements, are approved through a finding by the Planning Commission that the deviation shall result in a higher quality of development than would be possible using conventional zoning standards. Deviations are as follows:**
 - **The uses of attached dwellings rather than single family homes;**
 - **Interior private streets which are only allowed in a PUD;**
 - **The ordinance requires a minimum distance of 25 feet between contiguous buildings and the proposal is for a minimum of 20 feet.**
 - **Density is proposed to be 4.85 rather than the previously approved 5.45, and the overall density stated in the Master Plan is 3.5.**
 - **Signage was previously approved to be 120 square feet rather than 75.**

And with the following conditions:

1. **As per Sec. 22.2(B), the site will be serviced by public water and sanitary sewer, which is to be coordinated with the Department of Public Works.**
2. **A Storm Water Drain Permit (written approval by the Drain Commissioner's office) shall be submitted to the Township prior to the submission of any building permit applications for phases that have not already gained final development plan approval.**
3. **As per Sec. 22.11, a recorded PUD agreement shall be submitted. The agreement shall be submitted to the Township prior to the submission of any building permit applications for phases that have not already gained final development plan approval.**
4. **Approved permits are required for all signs and all signs shall be a minimum of 70 feet from the centerline of 48th Ave.**
5. **Each dwelling unit shall be provided with a minimum of 200 square feet of attached garage.**

Tom Healy said the density is getting better with this change and the architectural compliance is improving as a result of the reduction from an 80-unit building to 24 units.

Yeas: Jeannine Bolhouse, Donna Ferguson, Michael Moores, Jessica Ulberg, Tom Healy, Gary Veldink, Josiah Samy

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Moved by Donna Ferguson, seconded by Tom Healy, to adopt the staff report as finding of fact and to approve the final development plan for the next phase of the (PUD2102) Bauer Crossings PUD labeled as "phase 3", based on compliance with ordinance standards, as shown on the following documents:

1. **Application and narrative dated August 17, 2021;**
2. **Sheet No. C-205, Site plan dated 08.16.21;**
3. **Sheet No. C-300, Grading & Utility plan dated 08.16.21;**
4. **Sheet No. C-901, Open Space plan dated 08.16.21;**
5. **Sheet No. L-201, Landscape plan dated 08.16.21;**
6. **Sheet No. A1.1, Exterior Elevations (4 Unit Ranch Condo) dated 08.24.17;**
7. **Sheet No. 1/8, Front Elevation (6 Unit Condominium) dated 08.27.18;**
8. **Sheet 1 of 2, Maintenance Barn (Elevations) dated 07.07.21**

With the following conditions:

1. **As per Sec. 22.2(B), the site will be serviced by public water and sanitary sewer, which is to be coordinated with the Department of Public Works.**
2. **A Storm Water Drain Permit (written approval by the Drain Commissioner’s office) shall be submitted to the Township prior to the submission of any building permit applications for this phase.**
3. **As per Sec. 22.11, a recorded PUD agreement shall be submitted. The agreement shall be submitted to the Township prior to the submission of any building permit applications for this phase.**
4. **Approved permits are required for all signs and all signs shall be a minimum of 70 feet from the centerline of 48th Ave.**
5. **Each dwelling unit shall be provided with a minimum 200 square feet of attached garage.**
6. **The previous sign approval remains in effect.**

Yeas: Jeannine Bolhouse, Donna Ferguson, Michael Moores, Jessica Ulberg, Tom Healy, Gary Veldink, Josiah Samy

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

#210901-04 – Initiate Zoning Ordinance [Amendments](#)

There was discussion about revising Sec. 3.4(N), Sec. 3.4(P), and Sec. 3.4(G) regarding accessory buildings as follows:

Sec. 3.4 Accessory Building and Uses

- (E) **Maximum Floor Area. For all detached accessory buildings, the floor area shall include any area that has a roof supported by columns (i.e. a lean-to), as per the definition of a building in Chapter 2.**
- (N) **One (1) freestanding gazebo of one hundred forty four (144) square feet or less may be permitted in addition to accessory buildings permitted in subsection 3.4(E), (I), and (K) and shall meet requirements in Chapter 3 for location on a parcel. (revised 9-26-2005) The additional 144 square feet or less of a gazebo structure may be in the form of a detached structure or may be attached to an existing structure.**

- (P) One (1) freestanding pool **or lake** accessory building may be permitted in addition to accessory buildings permitted in subsection 3.4(E), (I), (K) and (N) provided that the square footage of the pool **or lake** accessory building does not exceed 200 square feet in area. The pool **or lake** accessory building shall meet the requirements in Chapter 3 for location on the parcel and shall only be allowed for swimming pools with at least 500 square feet in area **or for a lot adjacent to a lake that is at least 40 acres in area**. The pool accessory building shall be removed immediately if the pool is removed. (revised 8/10/09) **The additional 200 square feet or less of pool or lake accessory building may be in the form of a detached structure or may be attached to an existing structure.**

- (G) No detached accessory building in a Residential District (excluding AG and RR and accessory buildings for nonresidential principal uses) shall exceed fourteen (14) feet in mean height **except it may be up to 16 feet in height if evidence is provided that the additional height would make the accessory building more architecturally similar to the principal building**, or have a door opening greater than twelve (12) feet in height. No detached accessory buildings in an (AG) Agriculture or (RR) Rural Residential district (excluding buildings accessory to an agricultural operation) and no detached accessory building for a nonresidential principal use in a Residential District shall exceed sixteen (16) feet in mean height, or have a door opening greater than fourteen (14) feet in height. (revised July 25, 2011)

Moved by Gary Veldink, seconded by Donna Ferguson, to initiate a Zoning Ordinance amendment as presented.

Yeas: Jeannine Bolhouse, Donna Ferguson, Michael Moores, Jessica Ulberg, Tom Healy, Gary Veldink, Josiah Samy

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

There was discussion about revising the hotel parking requirement in Chapter 26 as follows:

Sec. 26.8 Table of Off-Street Parking Requirements

USE	PARKING SPACE PER UNIT OF MEASUREMENT AS FOLLOWS	
Motels, hotels and tourist homes (revised 6-8-1999)	3 <u>1</u>	Per two guest bedrooms <u>unit</u> plus <u>one per each employee working at a given time during the most intense time, plus</u> the amount required for each accessory uses including restaurants, lounges and gift shops <u>at 50% of the requirement as listed.</u>

Moved by Donna Ferguson, seconded by Jeannine Bolhouse, to initiate a Zoning Ordinance amendment as presented.

Yeas: Jeannine Bolhouse, Donna Ferguson, Michael Moores, Jessica Ulberg, Tom Healy, Gary Veldink, Josiah Samy

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

There was discussion about revising the definition of dwelling and dwelling unit as follows:

Sec. 2.29 Dwelling, Dwelling Unit

A dwelling unit is any building or portion thereof having cooking facilities which is occupied wholly as the home, residence or sleeping place of one family, either permanently or transiently, but in no case shall a motor home, trailer coach, automobile chassis, tent, or portable building be considered a dwelling. In case of mixed occupancy, where a building is occupied in part as a dwelling unit, the part so occupied shall be deemed a dwelling unit for the purpose of this ordinance and shall comply with the provisions thereof relative to dwellings. **If a dwelling unit has an attached independent space which includes cooking facilities and a sleeping space, and has its own separate entrance (even if it includes an entrance from the other dwelling structure), it shall be deemed a two-family dwelling unit and is only allowed in districts where a two-family dwelling unit is allowed. This includes the typical description of a “mother-in-law” suite where a person could live independently. For purposes of this ordinance cooking facility means kitchen amenities including, but not limited to, refrigerators, stoves, ovens, and kitchen-type sink. Amenities limited to a microwave, mini-refrigerator, and/or an appliance designed to produce coffee or tea do not constitute “cooking facilities” for purposes of this definition. An exception is a dwelling unit which has cooking facilities in a basement or lower level which is not considered to be a totally independent living area (such as a lake house).**

Josiah Samy said this is consistent with how mortgage lending would treat the example shown in the attachment. Mortgage lending would recognize that property as a duplex as well.

Moved by Donna Ferguson, seconded by Jessica Ulberg, to initiate a Zoning Ordinance amendment as presented.

Yeas: Jeannine Bolhouse, Donna Ferguson, Michael Moores, Jessica Ulberg, Tom Healy, Gary Veldink, Josiah Samy

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

There was discussion on allowing the creation of lots in a commercial district, that are a part of a larger development, to be exempt from the requirement of having frontage on a public or private street if there is access to the public or private street through easements or other legal means. The proposed ordinance amendment is as follows:

Sec. 2.55 Lot

A parcel of land occupied or intended for occupancy by a use permitted in this Ordinance, including one (1) main building with its accessory buildings, and providing the open spaces, parking spaces, and loading spaces required by this Ordinance. The word "lot" shall include plot or parcel. A lot need not be a "lot of record". A lot may also mean a portion of a condominium project, as regulated by Public Act 59 or 1978, as amended, designed and intended for separate ownership and use. All lots shall abut upon and have permanent access to a public or private street, **except as follows:**

a. If provided for otherwise in the ordinance; or

b. If a parcel in a commercial zoning district is part of a larger development with multiple parcels, then any parcel within the development may be exempt from the requirement to abut upon a public or private street contingent upon access being provided to a public or private street through an easement or other legal means.

Sec. 3.19 Street Access

Any lot of record created after the effective date of this Ordinance shall have frontage as required by this Ordinance upon a public street right-of-way or approved private street, except as may be otherwise provided for ~~otherwise~~ in a Planned Unit Development (Chap. XXII) or created in accordance with all the **other** applicable provisions of this ordinance. (revised 11-13-2000)

Sec. 3.29 Land Division Ordinance

(G) Standards for Approval of Land Divisions. (revised 4/24/17)

A proposed land division or property line adjustment reviewable by the Township shall be approved if the following criteria are met:

(1) All parcels created by the proposed division(s) or adjustment(s) have a minimum width as stipulated in Chapter 24 in the Georgetown Township Zoning Ordinance for the district in which it is located, to be measured as provided for in the applicable zoning ordinance. **If a commercial parcel complies with the provisions of the definition of a lot and does not abut upon a public or private street, the width of the parcel shall be determined by using the lot line adjacent to the easement which provides access to the public or private street as the front lot line.**

(4) The proposed land division(s) or adjustment(s) comply with all requirements of this Ordinance, the Georgetown Township Zoning Ordinance and the Land Division Act.

Jeannine Bolhouse said she does not agree with this proposed language change. She said from her experience, easements become a disaster from a legal standpoint.

Tom Healy and Gary Veldink agreed that easements create many issues.

Moved by Jeannine Bolhouse, seconded by Gary Veldink, to leave the language as currently written and to not initiate any amendments to these sections.

Yeas: Jeannine Bolhouse, Donna Ferguson, Michael Moores, Jessica Ulberg, Tom Healy, Gary Veldink, Josiah Samy

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

There was discussion about revising the definition of lot and lot width as follows:

Sec. 2.55 Lot

A parcel of land occupied or intended for occupancy by a use permitted in this Ordinance, including one (1) main building with its accessory buildings, and providing the open spaces, parking spaces, and loading spaces required by this Ordinance. The word "lot" shall include plot or parcel. A lot need not be a "lot of record". A lot may also mean a portion of a condominium project, as regulated by Public Act 59 of 1978, as amended, designed and intended for separate ownership and use. **For purposes of determining area use requirements, including the special use standards in Chapter 20, for a parcel having more than one zoning classification, the term "lot" is that portion of the parcel consisting of only the zoning classification which encompasses the proposed development.** All lots shall abut upon and have permanent access to a public or private street.

Sec. 2.65 Lot Width

The shortest distance separating the side lot lines at any point between the required front setback line and a line forty (40) feet to the rear of and parallel to the required front setback line. (revised August 1996) **For a horseshoe lot or U-shaped lot of which two portions of land within the parcel abut the same street, the lot width is determined by the single widest section. In no instance shall the sum of both portions of land be used to determine lot width.**

Moved by Jeannine Bolhouse, seconded by Gary Veldink, to initiate a Zoning Ordinance amendment as presented.

Yeas: Jeannine Bolhouse, Donna Ferguson, Michael Moores, Jessica Ulberg, Tom Healy, Gary Veldink, Josiah Samy

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

There was discussion about clarifying the language in Sec. 20.4(H) commercial soil removal as follows:

Sec. 20.4(H) Commercial Soil Removal

- (1) No soil, sand, gravel, or other earth material shall be removed from any land within the township without special land use approval, with the following exceptions:
 - a. When the earth removal is incidental to an operation for which a building permit has been issued by the township;
 - b. When the earth removal involves any normal landscaping, driveway installation and repairs, or other minor projects;

- c. The earth removal involves less than 100 cubic yards;
- d. The earth removal is for the purpose of constructing a swimming pool;
- e. ~~The earth removal will not be in violation of any other section of this ordinance, other Township ordinance, Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Act of 1972, or any other applicable state or federal law.~~
- f. A mineral mining license has been approved by the Mineral Mining Board and the operation complies with the terms and provisions of the mining license. (revised 4-27-06)

(2) **The earth removal will not be in violation of any other section of this ordinance, other Township ordinance, Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Act of 1972, or any other applicable state or federal law.**

Moved by Donna Ferguson, seconded by Jessica Ulberg, to initiate a Zoning Ordinance amendment as presented.

Yeas: Jeannine Bolhouse, Donna Ferguson, Michael Moores, Jessica Ulberg, Tom Healy, Gary Veldink, Josiah Samy

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

There was discussion about clarifying the language for changes to an approved PUD as follows:

Sec. 22.12 Changes To An Approved PUD

- (A) Notify Zoning Administrator: The holder of an approved PUD final development plan shall notify the Zoning Administrator of any desired change to the approved PUD.
- (B) Minor Change Determination: Minor changes may be approved by the Zoning Administrator upon determining that the proposed revision(s) will not alter the basic design and character of the PUD, nor any specific conditions imposed as part of the original approval. Minor changes shall include the following:
 - 1. Reduction of the size of any building and/or sign.
 - 2. Movement of buildings and/or signs by no more than ten (10) feet.
 - 3. Landscaping approved in the final development plan that is replaced by similar landscaping to an equal or greater extent.
 - 4. Changes in floor plans, of up to five (5) percent of the total floor area, which do not alter the character of the use or increase the amount of required parking.
 - 5. Internal rearrangement of a parking lot that does not affect the number of parking spaces or alter access locations or design.
 - 6. Changes required or requested by the Georgetown Township, Ottawa County, and other State or Federal regulatory agency in order to conform to other laws or regulations.
- (C) Major Change Determination: A proposed change not determined by the Zoning Administrator to be minor shall be submitted as an amendment to the PUD ~~and shall be processed in the same manner as the original PUD application for the final development plan.~~ **as follows:**

- 1. If the major change includes a change of a use category or includes substantial nonconformance with the conditions of approval of the initial preliminary development plan, the amendment shall be reviewed in accordance with Sec. 22.5 – 22.7 of this ordinance, including revised PUD rezoning.**
- 2. If the PUD zoning has already been established and the change does not include a change of a use category or substantial nonconformance with the conditions of approval of the initial preliminary plan, the preliminary development plan shall be reviewed only by the Planning Commission and approval shall be based on the standards for approval for the preliminary development plan. The original PUD zoning shall remain in effect.**

Moved by Jeannine Bolhouse, seconded by Gary Veldink, to initiate a Zoning Ordinance amendment as presented.

Yeas: Jeannine Bolhouse, Donna Ferguson, Michael Moores, Jessica Ulberg, Tom Healy, Gary Veldink, Josiah Samy

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

There was discussion about revising the ordinance language for kennels as follows:

Sec. 20.4(V) Kennels

- (1) The minimum lot size shall be one (1) acre.**
- (2) The maximum number of animals occupying the facility shall be four animals for the first one acre and an additional animal for each additional 1/3 acre.**
- (3) All animals shall be kept within a completely enclosed building at all times, with the exception that animals may be placed in an outdoor area for limited periods of time, under personal supervision by staff of the facility.**
- (4) Buildings wherein animals are kept, runs, and/or outdoor exercise areas shall not be located nearer than one hundred (100) feet to any adjacent residential district. Outdoor runs and/or exercise areas shall not be located in any front (including required and non-required), required rear or required side yard setback area and, in any case, shall not be located closer than 25 feet to any property line.**
- (5) All outdoor runs and/or exercise areas shall be enclosed by a six (6) foot high fence or other suitable barrier that is completely opaque and shall be screened by a greenbelt which meets the minimum standards of Sec. 3.11(A) for the extent of the exercise or other outdoor area.**
- (6) The Planning Commission may request any additional information deemed necessary to ensure compliance with all Township ordinances.**
- (7) The Planning Commission may impose any conditions of approval necessary to ensure compliance with Township ordinances and to mitigate any potential negative impacts related to the use to protect the health, safety, and general welfare of the surrounding area.**
- (8) Kennels shall comply with all applicable County, State, and Federal regulations.**
- (9) If public sewer is available, the facility shall be connected to the public sewer.**

(10) In all districts where kennels are allowed, except for the AG and RR districts, sidewalks shall be installed adjacent to all public and private streets.

Tom Healy said kennels in the AG, RR, NS, CS, HS, and I districts should all be subject to the site design standards under Sec. 20.4(V).

Gary Veldink said he agrees with Tom Healy.

Tom Healy said the purpose of zoning is to buffer incompatible uses from each other and kennels should be site specific.

Moved by Gary Veldink, seconded by Jessica Ulberg, to continue to allow kennels with a special use permit in AG, RR, NS and CS districts with the proposed SUP standards, to continue to allow kennels by right in the HS and I districts with the proposed SUP standards, to continue to prohibit kennels in the LDR, LMR, MDR, MHR, MHP, and OS districts, and to initiate a Zoning Ordinance amendment as presented.

Tom Healy said he is not in favor of permitting kennels by right in the HS and I districts because that takes away the option for the Planning Commission to place conditions of approval on the permit and it would be counter to maintaining the public’s health, safety, and welfare. He said a special use permit should be required in all districts that allow it.

Jeannine Bolhouse said she agrees with Tom Healy.

Yeas: Donna Ferguson, Jessica Ulberg, Gary Veldink, Josiah Samy

Nays: Jeannine Bolhouse, Tom Healy, Michael Moores

MOTION CARRIED.

There was discussion about revising the language for reconstruction of damaged non-conforming buildings and structures as follows:

Sec. 27.4 Reconstruction Of Damaged Non-Conforming Building And Structures

Nothing in this Ordinance shall prevent the reconstruction, repair or restoration and the continued use of any non-conforming building or structure damaged by fire, collapse, explosion, acts of God or acts of public enemy, subsequent to the effective date of this Ordinance, wherein the expense of such reconstruction does not exceed fifty (50) percent of the fair valuation of the entire building or structure at the time such damage occurred. The valuation of the proposed construction shall be subject to the approval of the Zoning Administrator whose decision may be appealed to the Board of Appeals.

If the reconstruction exceeds fifty (50) percent, the reconstruction may take place provided that:

- 1. The reconstructed building or structure does not exceed 125% of allowable floor area and height in the district it is located in;**

- 2. The location on the lot complies with at least 75% of each setback requirements (front, side, rear) for the district it is located in;**
- 3. The reconstruction is not detrimental to the public health, safety, and general welfare of the Township, as determined by the Zoning Administrator whose decision may be appealed to the Board of Appeals.**

~~, and provided that~~ Such restoration and resumption shall take place within six (6) months of the time of such damage and that it be completed within one (1) year from the time of such damage, and provided further, that said use be identical with the non-conforming use permitted and in effect directly preceding said damage. Where pending insurance claims require an extension of time, the Zoning Administrator may grant a time extension of six (6) months, provided that the property owner submit a certification from the insurance company attesting to the delay. Until such time as the debris from the damage is fully removed, the premises shall be adequately fenced or screened from access by children who may be attracted to the premises.

Moved by Jeannine Bolhouse, seconded by Gary Veldink, to initiate a Zoning Ordinance amendment as presented.

Yeas: Jeannine Bolhouse, Donna Ferguson, Michael Moores, Jessica Ulberg, Tom Healy, Gary Veldink, Josiah Samy

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

There was discussion about revising the site design standards for K-12 schools under Sec. 20.4(U) as follows:

Sec. 20.4(U) K-12 Schools

- (1) Minimum site size for elementary schools shall be 20 acres, middle schools shall be 30 acres, and high schools shall be 40 acres. Where a combination exists, the greater land area shall apply **(only for schools with an enrollment of greater than 25 students per grade).**
- (2) Minimum lot width of 200 ft. abutting an arterial street; and at least one means of ingress and egress shall be located on such street.
- (3) Athletic fields shall not be located closer than two hundred (200) ft. from any property line abutting a residential zoning district.
- (4) A greenbelt shall be provided in accordance with Sec. 3.11 where, in the opinion of the Planning Commission, screening is needed to minimize visual, noise, or other impacts from the proposed development.

Gary Veldink said local zoning standards shouldn't exist for private schools because it puts them at an unfair disadvantage while public schools do not have to follow them.

Jeannine Bolhouse said private schools should be regulated by zoning so they don't do anything they want and the only reason why the Township doesn't regulate public schools is because there is no authority to do so.

Josiah Samy said he thinks the minimum site size requirement puts private schools at an unfair disadvantage.

Donna Ferguson said she thinks the acreage in the minimum site size requirement is excessive and said it should be lessened. She said the proposed language should be rewritten.

Josiah Samy said he would like to see a list of schools and their size.

Jeannine Bolhouse said she would like to see definitions for elementary, middle, and high schools. She said one thing to take into consideration is some high schoolers drive.

Moved by Donna Ferguson, seconded by Tom Healy, to rewrite the proposed ordinance language for the Planning Commission to discuss at a future meeting and to not initiate any amendments to this section at this time.

Yeas: Jeannine Bolhouse, Donna Ferguson, Michael Moores, Jessica Ulberg, Tom Healy, Gary Veldink, Josiah Samy

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

#210901-05 – Public Comments

No one was present to make public comments at this time.

#210901-06 – Other Business

There was no other business at this time.

#210901-07 – Adjournment - The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Yeas: Jeannine Bolhouse, Donna Ferguson, Michael Moores, Jessica Ulberg, Tom Healy, Gary Veldink, Josiah Samy

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.