

**NORTHFIELD TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION  
NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING  
April 20, 2016 at 7:00 p.m.  
Second Floor, Public Safety Building  
8350 Main Street, Whitmore Lake, MI 48189**

**AGENDA**

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- 3. ROLL CALL**
- 4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
- 5. CALL TO THE PUBLIC**
- 6. CORRESPONDENCE**
- 7. REPORTS**
  - A. Board of Trustees Report**
  - B. ZBA**
  - C. Staff Report**
  - D. Planning Consultant Report**
- 8. PUBLIC HEARINGS**
- 9. OLD BUSINESS**
  - A. Lake Overlay Zoning**
  - B. Discussion of Policy for Petitioners' Requests to the Planning Commission**
- 10. NEW BUSINESS**
- 11. MINUTES:** April 6, 2016 Regular Meeting
- 12. POLICY REVIEW AND DISCUSSION**
- 13. CALL TO THE PUBLIC**
- 14. COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSIONERS**
- 15. ANNOUNCEMENT:** Next Regular Meeting – May 4, 2016
- 16. ADJOURNMENT**

This notice is posted in compliance with PA 267 Of 1976 as amended (open meetings act) MCLA 41.7 2A (2) (3) and the Americans with Disabilities Act. (ADA) Individuals with disabilities requiring auxiliary aids or services should contact the Northfield Township Office, (734) 449-5000 seven days in advance.

8350 Main Street, Whitmore Lake, MI 48189-0576  
[www.twp.northfield.mi.us](http://www.twp.northfield.mi.us)

Telephone: (734) 449-5000

Fax: (734) 449 -0123

Website:

**MEMO**

**TO:** Northfield Township Planning Commission  
**FROM:** Sally Hodges, AICP, Senior Vice President  
**SUBJECT:** Proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendments re. Lake Overlay District  
**DATE:** April 13, 2016

At the February 17<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission meeting, we discussed the characteristics of two potential lake overlay districts that would cover those parcels zoned SR1 and SR2 that abut the Township's three developed lakes. The purpose of the overlay districts is to better reflect existing lot sizes and conditions typical of these lots around the lakes. In the course of the February discussion, you asked us to:

1. Provide additional information regarding setback regulations and potential requirements for decks and docks, and
2. Review the impact that reducing the front yard setbacks would have on the existing conditions around the lakes, particularly with regard to availability and the location of residential parking.

**COMMENTS**

**1. Decks and Docks**

There are generally two types of deck locations: decks that are attached to the principal structure, such as a house, and freestanding decks. The zoning ordinance requires attached decks to meet the same setback standards as the principal structure. Article IV. Schedule of District Regulations, (g) exempts freestanding decks from the setback regulations and allows them to be located anywhere on a lot.

Permanent docks require approval from Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ). Seasonal docks for non-commercial use do not typically require a permit from the MDEQ. The proposed lake overlay district zoning amendments would not affect the location of freestanding decks or docks, nor do we propose any changes to these regulations.

**2. Street Front Yard Setbacks**

The conditions at each of the three lakes relative to the street front yard setbacks and parking are described below:

**a. Whitmore Lake**

The homes along Whitmore Lake do not have a consistent street front setback. In general, Beckett & Raeder found that the homes are located closer than 30 feet from the



road right-of-way. Reducing the setback to 10 feet would reduce the number of nonconforming lots. The concern that we discussed with the Commission has to do with safety and visibility for vehicles pulling in and out of the residential lots. In some shallow front setback situations, the owner has designed a parking pad for parking parallel the roadway rather than a 90-degree pull-in/pull-out. Such a parking design can minimally fit in a 10 foot setback. After review, we continue to support the 10 foot street front yard setback recommendation around Whitmore Lake. Some typical conditions can be seen on the aerial photos below.



**b. Wildwood Lake Setbacks**

According to Beckett & Raeder, the homes along Wildwood Lake meet the street front yard setback requirement of the zoning district. We believe the reduction to a 10 foot street front setback is not necessary and could create a lack of consistency and unintended problems between neighbors. The homes also have driveways that accommodate cars.



In addition, the inventory conducted by Beckett & Raeder found that 11 lots have nonconforming side yard setbacks. Applying the proposed reduced side yard setback requirements would only reduce the number of nonconforming lots by 2, to 9. Unlike the older residential developments along the other lakes, Wildwood has been developed to meet the zoning ordinance. Changing the side yard setbacks could upset the development patterns of the neighborhood and cause conflicts with neighbors. Therefore, it appears that there is little need for a lake overlay district on Wildwood Lake.



**c. Horseshoe Lake Setbacks**

Lake Shore Drive provides access to the majority of lakefront lots on Horseshoe Lake. Lake Shore Drive is unpaved and has a 50 foot right-of-way. A large percentage of the lots along Horseshoe Lake do not meet even the minimal 10 foot street front setback proposed for the Whitmore Lake Overlay district. As a result, a 0 foot street front setback is proposed for the Horseshoe Lake Overlay district. Some of the homes with a nonconforming front yard setback have recessed garages that allow parking next to the house. Other nonconforming lots have a driveway along the side of the house that allows parking in the side yard or a parking pad for parking parallel to the street. A 0 foot street front setback would be consistent with the development pattern and there would be limited traffic conflicts due to the lower speed and lower volume nature of the streets surrounding Horseshoe Lake.

Adopting the proposed side yard setback requirements will reduce the number of nonconforming lots around Horseshoe Lake. See photos below.





### **3. Lakefront Rear Yard Setbacks**

Currently the SR1 and SR2 districts require a 20 foot setback for buildings from the lake and almost all lots were reported in the prior report as conforming to that standard. Because the primary purpose of these new overlay districts is to better accommodate the developed lakefront lots, many of which were platted and development patterns established many years ago, we believe there would be very limited value in increasing the lakefront setback to 25 feet as was recommended in the Beckett and Raeder report.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Previously, the proposed Whitmore Lake Overlay District included Wildwood Lake. Our analysis of the existing conditions and development pattern at Wildwood Lake indicates that an overlay district would be of limited use based on the existing development, and could cause future conflicts. Our revised recommendations are summarized below.

### **Lake Overlay Districts**

1. **Whitmore Lake Overlay District.** This overlay district would apply to all SR1 and SR2 parcels abutting Whitmore Lake (only the waterfront parcels, not those that have no water frontage). In this Overlay District, the yard and setback requirements of the underlying district shall be replaced with the following:
  - a. **Street Front Yard:** Not less than 10 feet.
  - b. **Side Yards:** Not less than 10 feet; except in the case where the lot does not meet the requirements for minimum lot width. In the case where the lot does not meet the requirements for minimum lot width, the narrowest side yard shall not be less than 5 feet or 15% of the lot width, whichever is greater, and the sum of the two side yards shall not be less than 30% of the lot width.
  - c. **Lakefront Rear Yard:** Not less than 20 feet, consistent with the Ordinance as currently applied.
  
2. **Horseshoe Lake Overlay District.** This overlay district would apply to all SR1 and SR2 parcels abutting Horseshoe Lake. In this Overlay District, the yard and setback requirements of the underlying district shall be replaced with the following:
  - a. **Street Front Yard:** No minimum setback.
  - b. **Side Yards:** Not less than 10 feet; except in the case where the lot does not meet the requirements for minimum lot width. In the case where the lot does not meet the requirements for minimum lot width, the narrowest side yard shall not be less than 5 feet or 15% of the lot width, whichever is greater, and the sum of the two side yards shall not be less than 30% of the lot width.
  - c. **Lakefront Rear Yard:** Not less than 20 feet, consistent with the Ordinance as currently applied.

If the Commission agrees with the above recommendations, the appropriate action would be to direct us to put the standards into draft zoning ordinance text for your further consideration. We look forward to discussing this topic with you at your April 20, 2016 meeting.

**NORTHFIELD TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
Minutes of Regular Meeting  
April 6, 2016**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Kenneth Dignan at 7:10 P.M. at 8350 Main Street.

**2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**3. ROLL CALL**

**AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM**

Roll call:

Janet Chick	Present
Marlene Chockley	Present
Brad Cousino	Present
Kenneth Dignan	Present
Sam Iaquinto	Present
Larry Roman	Present
Mark Stanalajczo	Present

Also present:

Township Manager Howard Fink  
Assessing & Building Assistant Mary Bird  
Planning Consultant Sally Hodges, McKenna Associates  
Recording Secretary Lisa Lemble  
Members of the Community

**4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

- ▶ **Motion:** Stanalajczo moved, Chick supported, that the agenda be adopted as amended.  
**Motion carried 7—0 on a voice vote.**

**5. FIRST CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

**By-laws/Commission Goals.** Craig Warburton, 450 W. Joy Road, David Perry, 9441 Earhart Road, and David Gordon, 5558 Hellner, urged denial of the proposed by laws for a variety of reasons. David Gordon asked that preservation of natural features, open space, and farmland be the Commission's main priority.

**6. CORRESPONDENCE**

Dignan referred to one letter in the packet from a member of the public.

**7. REPORTS**

**7A. Board of Trustees**

Chick reported the Board heard presentations on plans for road improvements and on the sewer study, and approved an offer to purchase the Van Curler property.

**7B. ZBA**

No report.

**7C. Staff Report**

Nothing to report.

**7D. Planning Consultant**

Nothing to report.

**8. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**9A. Addition of Church Uses and Related Amendments.**

Dignan and Iaquinto recused themselves from this discussion due to their involvement with a church which had brought this issue to the Commission. Stanalajczo chaired the meeting for this item.

- ▶ **Motion:** Chick moved, Chockley supported, that the public hearing be opened.  
**Motion carried 5—2 on a roll call vote, Dignan and Iaquinto recusing themselves due to a potential conflict of interest.**

Frank Murdock, 2020 Tibbits Court, Ann Arbor, congregational president of Living Water Church in Whitmore Lake, thanked the Commission for considering these changes, explaining that the church has signed a purchase agreement for property conditioned upon application for a conditional use permit being an option.

- ▶ **Motion:** Chockley moved, Chick supported, that the public hearing be closed.  
**Motion carried 5—2 on a roll call vote, Dignan and Iaquinto recusing themselves due to a potential conflict of interest.**

**9. OLD BUSINESS**

**9A. Revision to Planning Commission By-Laws**

- ▶ **Motion:** Dignan moved, Stanalajczo supported, that the proposed by-laws be adopted with the addition of the statement, "An affirmative vote of a majority of seated Planning Commissioners shall be necessary for a recommendation to adopt a master plan or any portion thereof."

The Commission discussed the pros and cons of this and of requiring a specific number of votes to amend a master plan.

- ▶ **Motion:** Stanalajczo moved, Iaquinto supported, that the by-laws be adopted as amended at this meeting.
- ▶ **Amendment to motion:** Chockley moved, Iaquinto supported, that Stanalajczo's motion be amended to accept the Township attorney's recommendation to delete the wording "...at the Northfield Township Office" from Section 8.1.

Stanalajczo called for a roll call vote.

Amendment to motion carried 7—0 on a roll call vote.

Original motion carried 6—1 on a roll call vote, Chockley opposed.

**9B. Addition of Church Uses and Related Amendments.**

Dignan and Iaquinto recused themselves from this discussion due to their involvement with a church which had brought this issue to the Commission and Stanalajczo chaired the meeting for this item.

► **Motion:** Stanalajczo moved, Roman supported, to adopt the changes as presented in the notice and the Commission packet for the zoning changes, and make a recommendation to the Township Board that they adopt these changes for the addition of church uses and related amendments. **Motion carried 5—2 on a roll call vote, Dignan and Iaquinto recusing themselves due to a potential conflict of interest.**

**9C. Review and Adoption of Planning Commission 206 Goals and Objectives**

Commissioners briefly discussed the list of potential goals and objectives they had identified. McKenna said she would do some research and Dignan said he would present a revised list at the next meeting for further discussion.

**10. NEW BUSINESS**

None.

**11. MINUTES**

**March 16, 2016, Regular Meeting**  
Chockley made several minor corrections.

► **Motion:** Iaquinto moved, Stanalajczo supported, that the minutes of the March 16, 2016, regular meeting be approved as corrected, and to dispense with the reading. **Motion carried 7—0 on a voice vote.**

**12. POLICY REVIEW AND DISCUSSION**

None.

**13. SECOND CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

**By-laws.** Craig Warburton and David Gordon expressed disappointed in adoption of the by-laws.

**14. COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSIONERS**

**By-laws.** There was a brief discussion about the meaning of the word “seated” used in the by-laws.

**Van Curler Property.** Iaquinto spoke in support of the Township Board’s actions to consider purchase of this property.

**15. ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEXT MEETING**

**April 20, 2016,** at 7:00 P.M. at the Public Safety Building was announced as the next regular Commission meeting time and location.

**16. ADJOURNMENT**

► **Motion:** Iaquinto moved, Chick supported, that the meeting be adjourned. **Motion carried 7—0 on a voice vote.**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:03 P.M.

---

Prepared by Lisa Lemble.  
Corrections to the originally issued minutes are indicated as follows:  
Wording removed is ~~stricken through~~; wording added is underlined.

Adopted on \_\_\_\_\_, 2016.

---

Kenneth Dignan, Chair

---

Mark Stanalajczo, Secretary

Official minutes of all meetings are available on the Township’s website at <http://www.twp-northfield.org/government/>