

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MONITOR  
SPECIAL JOINT MEETING  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2022

The meeting was called to order by Supervisor Spencer at 5:44 p.m.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited by all present.

Members present: **Trustees:** T. Spencer, L. Ferguson, S. Pike, G. Brandt, R. Walsh, T. McCulloch, E. Arnold.

**Planning Commission Members:** J. Bellor, R. Campbell, A. Shabluk, B. Walsh, J. Meier, C. Schweitzer, E. Rosenbrock

**ZBA Members:** J. Horen, A. Lyday, J. Krueger, G. Brandt, D. Zube, C. Schweitzer

**Professionals:** R. Sheppard, Attorney, J. Jackson, Planner, Andrew Littman, Planner, M. Kain, Engineer D. Scherzer, Engineer

Members absent: None

**Motion by McCulloch, supported by Walsh to adopt the agenda as presented.**

**Motion carried**

**Public Input**

Supervisor Spencer opened public comment at 5:45 pm

A resident addressed the group, questioned if a flyer was mailed to the public regarding the ordinance changes

Public input closed at 5:46

**Unfinished Business**

Spencer thanked all members for their work on these revisions.

Spencer mentioned that we will not be voting on the proposed amendment changes tonight but will be discussing as a group, answering any questions and providing clarifications.

**Accessory Buildings**

Krueger thanked the Planning Commission and the Planners for the changes to the chart, footnote 5, and other clarifications. Questioned if a lot does not have property line clarifications, how does the Building Authority (zoning administrator) know where property lines are?

Sheppard responded; do we want to require a survey? Should this be the responsibility of the property owners? This has been discussed several times, but places the responsibility on the property owner, not on the Township.

Brandt questioned side yard setbacks, principal structure.

Jackson responded; detached language should comply with side yard setbacks per the chart.

Brandt also questioned the chart, condition 6.

Jackson and Sheppard responded.

Horen thanked the PC for all the work on the amendments, the chart, etc. Horen questioned how outside storage will be addressed going forward?

Spencer responded that it will be consistent with current method. Sheppard also provided comment, mentioned the blight ordinance.

Pike asked for clarification on condition 8, problems with reading with Draft version written over the text.

Krueger responded.

Meier asked if we should have discussed definitions before discussing all the other proposed changes to the ordinances.

Sheppard commented that the intent is to combine versions into one amendment, set public hearing

Krueger asked Sheppard about the situation with Mr. Horneber.

Sheppard responded that this would fall under Yard requirements – projection into rear yard.

Don Scherzer commented on typos on all documents – Authority is misspelled; questioned where reference is made to an appendix when none listed.

Arnold questioned chart, condition 5, storm water drainage system definition. Would like to see definition of storm water drainage. Arnold stated that a survey should be provided by the property owner to show the building official exact property lines (survey stakes) when building larger accessory buildings.

Sheppard responded to special use permits when selling ag properties with accessory buildings.

Arnold also feels the chart is complicated and confusing.

Sheppard asked if we should require surveys.

Arnold commented, “may want to add 5 d – need survey to get this reduction in side yard.”

Jackson commented that we may want to adjust this to anything over 28,000 sq ft lot size or requesting reduction in setback, should require a survey,

Krueger agreed.

Brandt feels should require survey in all situations.

Shabluk stated if they are outside a subdivision, without meets and bounds, we should require a survey.

Resident asked about age of survey and if that mattered.

### **Fence Amendments**

Brandt questioned section 3.13 (a) (2) opacity and what that meant.

Sheppard responded.

Jackson also provided comment regarding height in clear vision areas.

Bellor commented on trees and planting in clear vision area.

Jackson responded.

Scherzer questioned phrasing in 3.13 (a) (2) – per linear foot.

Sheppard and Jackson provided comment.

### **Yard Definitions**

Pike questioned structures, gazebo.

Sheppard commented that a gazebo is not a structure and does not count as an accessory building.

No other comments from the Board of Trustees, Planning Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals.

### **Sign amendments**

Spencer asked about the new sign for the township office;

Sheppard and Littman responded.

Brandt questioned city codes – 8 (c) iv, should read, “Township codes.”

Arnold questioned section 15.05 (h) 6, animation, motion pictures, etc. and the concern of distraction.

Sheppard commented.

Arnold feels this section should be eliminated to prohibit animation, motion pictures, etc. Discussion ensued regarding changeable copy in C, I and R districts and how often copy is changed.

Spencer questioned Jackson about what is allowed in other townships/cities;

Jackson provided comment.

Spencer is supportive of the changes as presented and does not feel we should alter the proposed amendment regarding signage.

Sheppard commented that this is a Planning Commission recommendation and if the Board suggests changes, they provide it to the Planning Commission for revision.

### **Storage Containers**

Sheppard commented that this information is found in 3.27 (m).

Horen commented that storage containers often take away from parking spaces originally required, ordinance is needed to address these.

McCulloch questioned if there is a limit to the number of storage containers; Sheppard responded.

Ferguson questioned need for permit longer than 90 days;

Sheppard responded.

Brandt questioned regulation within the various districts

Sheppard responded. "It would be a good idea to add that 3.27 section (m) refers to Residential District only."

Spencer thanked everyone for their attendance, the Planning Commission for all the work that went into the ordinance amendment changes,

**Motion by Walsh supported by McCulloch to adjourn.  
Motion carried.**

Meeting was adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Connie Schweitzer  
Secretary  
CS/djp