

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MONITOR  
REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
May 2, 2017

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Bellor at 7:00 p.m.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Members present: J. Bellor, R. Campbell, D. Darland, J. Frank, C. Hoyle, T. Miller, and B. Reder  
Members absent: None  
Also present: R. Sheppard, Planning Attorney; P. Lippens, Planner  
Public present: See Sign-In Sheet

Motion by B. Reder seconded by R. Campbell to adopt the agenda as corrected with the **addition of the Swimming Pool Ordinance #18**, under **Ordinance Review**.  
**Motion carried.**

Motion by R. Campbell seconded by B. Reder to approve the minutes of the April 4, 2017 regular meeting as presented.  
**Motion carried.**

**Public Input**

Chairman Bellor opened and closed public comment at 7:04 p.m. with no one present to speak.

**Items for Consideration**

Chairman J. Bellor opened up the public hearing at 7:05 p.m., asking P. Lippens to offer his review of the Special Land Use application for **St. Catherine of Siena (St Vincent De Paul) 2956 E. North Union 09-100-024-200-030-00** for their **64'L X 42'W** (includes overhang) Accessory Building, Ordinance #52, Section 5.02 (e). P. Lippens states that if the Planning Commission is satisfied with accepting the site sketch in lieu of a complete site plan, and viewing the application for the storage structure as an addition to an existing storage use that is on the site, then it would qualify for a sketch plan review based on the sketch plan requirements. P. Lippens continues stating that he recommends that the Township engineer look at the submittal to confirm proper drainage and also to approve the north entrance. He continues commenting about landscaping, parking, and remarks that the site has ample room to build deferred parking if it was required. His recommendation is to approve the sketch plan contingent on the Planning Commission concurring that the proximity of the new storage building to the existing storage building is functionally an addition which makes it eligible for a site sketch plan review and that approval is contingent on the Township engineer review and acceptance of a site sketch plan. In addition, the site is required to maintain compliance with site lighting requirements. In closing, P. Lippens contends that as a special land use, the project is consistent with the requirements.

T. Miller inquired about the landscaping in P. Lippens review. P. Lippens indicated that in his aerial inspection, the existing landscaping appears to be sufficient.

J. Frank commented about the two site plans that were received and inquired if the current one was the correct and final version. R. Rabadeu, St. Catherine of Siena Parish's Contractor confirmed the correct site sketch submitted on April 17, 2017 and the 37'ft setback from the property line. There is 39'ft between the proposed building and the school building. J. Frank is concerned about the Consumers Energy electrical easement and that the proposed structure appears to be directly under the power lines. R. Rabadeu states that there is a 15'ft right-of-way for Consumers Energy, and the structure will be built allowing for a 17'ft setback.

D. Darland made a motion B. Reder supported to **close the Public Hearing at 7:42 p.m.**  
**Motion carried.**

Motion 1 of 2 St. Catherine of Siena Parish

J. Frank made a motion supported by C. Hoyle **to approve the special use permit for St. Catherine of Siena Parish (St Vincent DePaul) for the construction of a 64'L X 42'W** (includes overhang) **accessory building** with approval needed for acceptance of a site plan or the current site sketch, provided that storm drainage be directed south of property line.

**Roll Call Vote:**

Yes: Campbell, Darland, Frank, Hoyle, Miller, Reder, Bellor

No: None

Absent: None

**Motion carried.**

Motion 2 of 2 St. Catherine of Siena Parish

T. Miller made a motion supported by D. Darland to approve the site sketch as submitted by St. Catherine of Siena Parish to request a special use permit to construct a 64'L X 42'W (which includes overhang) accessory building. The Planning Commission has determined that the site sketch is an appropriate use in this circumstance due to the fact it is accompanying a special use permit and is not a significant alteration or building expansion in contrast to the existing structures. Furthermore, the **Township engineer shall review the site sketch and site if necessary** to determine if a complete, engineered, site plan is required to insure the health, safety and welfare of the property and surrounding properties. The site is also required to maintain **compliance with Township lighting requirements**, and **any suggestions or requirements by the engineer be met** before a building permit be issued, and lastly that **all other permits and approvals from other agencies and departments be obtained** if applicable.

**Roll Call Vote:**

Yes: Darland, Frank, Hoyle, Miller, Reder, Campbell, Bellor

No: None

Absent: None

**Motion carried.**

R. Sheppard states that as soon as the Township engineer is able to provide a review and give clearance, the building process can begin.

**Ordinance Review**

**Self-Storage and Warehousing Criteria**

The Planning Commission reviewed the definitions and proposed Ordinance that P. Lippens provided. C. Hoyle questioned the complexity of the proposed amendment as it relates to waiving certain standards in the commercial district. J. Bellor gave examples of how the waiver could be applied in certain situations, giving the Planning Commission the flexibility in making improved decisions based on individual circumstance. D. Darland inquired about the recommendation for I-1 (Industrial) Zoning District. P. Lippens states that a Self-Storage Facility, with distribution, would only be permitted in the Industrial District with Special Land Use approval which would allow the Planning Commission to set specific standards for distribution activities.

T. Miller made a motion supported by J. Frank **to approve the Self-Storage and Warehousing criteria** as written and submitted by P. Lippens, Township Planner.

**Motion carried.**

### **Private Garages and Accessory Buildings**

R. Sheppard provided the Hampton Township ordinance to review. The current Township Ordinance was recently amended to allow a size of an attached garage to be a maximum of 80% of the main structure, with a cap of 1400 sq ft, whichever is less. The purpose of today's discussion would be to provide criteria, if desired, to the height standard of garages in the final version of the updated Ordinance. J. Frank stated that the maximum height of an unattached and attached garage needs to be addressed, making certain that an attached garage can be no higher than the roofline or peak of the home. R. Sheppard agreed, stating that likewise, on a detached garage, no second floor should be allowed, and the height no higher than the roofline or peak of the home. P. Lippens commented, stating that this would be considered a change as currently, detached garages, as defined in 3.26 (b) could not exceed a height of 35' feet. R. Sheppard clarifies, stating that the height limitation on the accessory building is different than that of a garage. It is allowable to construct an accessory building with higher sidewalls.

### **Solar Energy Farms**

The Planning Commission asked P. Lippens, Planner to provide a written recommendation for review at the June 6, 2017 regular meeting.

### **Pool Ordinance #18**

The Planning Commission asked P. Lippens, Planner to provide a written recommendation for review at the June 6, 2017 regular meeting.

### **Reports**

P. Lippens provided a report of his April 21, 2017 phone conversation with Damon Brown, ATF regarding David Wallace, FFL. Mr. Brown wanted to make sure the Township was aware that the ATF cannot revoke Mr. Wallace's license if he operates outside of his special use approval, yet is within his legal authority to do so under his FFL license. The enforcement is the Townships responsibility. Taking into consideration the strict and comprehensive use conditions that the Planning Commission required and imposed on Mr. Wallace, the Commissioners agreed that no further reinforcement is needed to remind the applicant to stay in compliance and within the parameters of his approval.

### **Communications**

Motion by C. Hoyle supported by B. Campbell to accept Communications.

**Motion carried.**

Motion by C. Hoyle supported by J. Frank to adjourn.

**Motion carried.**

Meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Darland  
Secretary

DD/blfp