

Planning Commission FEBRUARY 29, 2012



CAMBRIDGE TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

FEBRUARY 29, 2012

Gidner stated that the public comments will be kept to five (5) minutes.

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. In attendance were Ken Gidner, Mike Albain, Tanya Riley Van Wagner, Tom Van Wagner, Kevin O'Mara, Ed Plentz, Theresa Friess and Doug Lake.

Albain made the motion to approve minutes from the January 25, 2012 meeting. Riley Van Wagner seconded the motion. There was no further discussion. Yes – 8, no – 0. All in favor. Motion carried.

There was no other business to come before the planners.

Old Business: A. Fence Ordinance. Plentz and others met and amended the ordinance to change some of the wording that some people were confused about. Changes were sent out for comments and none were received until Phill Schaedler sent his comments tonight at 7:00 p.m. Plentz felt it really didn't change anything in the ordinance just took out a few words that were redundant. O'Mara thought that it had changed substantially by eliminating fences in the front yard of lake residential districts. There was general discussion on Schaedler's suggestion and interpretation of the planners. O'Mara agrees with Schaedler's revision rather than the way originally written. Larry Van De Velde asked for clarification of proposed ordinance. If house sets back 100' in lake residential, then no fences are allowed in that yard all the way to the house, is that correct? Yes, front yard or required front yard per Plentz. Further discussion on "front yard" and "required front yard" and definitions of same. Discussion on Section 4.5 and Section 2.2.51. Rick Richardson asked if for the purposes of this, is the definition of front yard and required front yard the same? Plentz said no. Richardson asked which way do we want it. Plentz felt that these revisions were keeping fences out of the front yard. Further discussion and clarification of "front yard", "required front yard" and what is and becomes "side yards". It was still felt that the way worded was too ambiguous. Discussion of 50' setback and purpose of same. It was decided that Section 5.15.1 would state the following: Fences in RL-1 zoning district shall not be located in the front yard as defined in section 2.2.51 and required front yard as defined in section 4.5. Fences in the side and rear yards of properties in RL-1 zoning districts shall not exceed four (4) feet in height and will be of open design (such as chain link, split rail, etc.). Motion was made by Plentz to accept the proposed fence ordinance with the amendment and to set for public hearing, send to Region II and then to the township board. Lake seconded the motion. There was some further discussion. Yes – 7, no – 1. Motion carried. (Proposed ordinance attached.)

B. Adult Entertainment. Gidner stating that they would not be addressing this evening.

C. Wind Energy. Gidner stated that Schaedler did come back with four issues that Region II had with the proposed ordinance. He addressed three of the issues, one being the formatting of document, another being the designation where the large, commercial wind energy units could be placed, being Ag and Commercial properties. The small units up to 80' were designated to Ag, Industrial, C-4 and single family dwelling districts. The other issue was the 40 decibels and it was felt not out of line and no changes were made. He did indicate changes need to be made to amend zoning ordinance to add conditional uses. Richardson asked about height

limitations in each district. Each of these districts have a height limitation for accessory structures. Are you going with the height limitation already set for each district or are you going with a different limitation? Plentz suggested that Section 4.5 would have to be amended per Schaedler's recommendation. Richardson stated that if it is set up as is, we are stuck with the height limitation for accessory structures of each district. Lake stated that it is recommended to have at or near 100' height to have the turbines be effective. Plentz stated that by having the height at 80' and the setback being 1 ½ times would limit the turbines pretty much to Ag. Further discussion on height restrictions and size of land. Gidner stated again that now the way written would be restricted to the height restriction in the specific district. Schaedler had suggested that the following sections would need to be revised: 4.1, 4.5 and 5.6. Discussion on accessory structures and towers and adding definition of tower. O'Mara would like to see more examples of how others are doing. It was decided that Gidner would do some further research and Van Wagner will give a report next month. Richardson didn't think need a site plan review, it was the zoning officer's responsibility. Only need conditional use for the utility grids, not for the on-site turbines. Plentz suggested adding some language to Section 4.5.4 in regards to the height of the tower. Motion by O'Mara to table subject until next meeting. Albain seconded the motion. No further discussion. Yes – 8, no – 0. All in favor. Motion carried.

New Business: There was none.

Motion to adjourn meeting was made by Albain, Riley Van Wagner seconded. No further discussion. Yes – 8, no – 0. All in favor. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 7:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Pat Steele, Recording Secretary