FENTON TOWNSHIP CIVIC COMMUNITY CENTER  
12060 MANTAWAUKA DRIVE, FENTON, MICHIGAN

Chairman Tucker called meeting to order at 6:38 p.m.  
Present: Franz, Ochodnicky, Richard, Root, Spees, Tucker  
Recording Secretaries McDonald & Sharich, Zoning Administrator, Piggott  
Absent: Carlson

Secretary Pro-Tem Root chosen.  
Carlson arrived at 6:50 p.m.

SP07-004 Karl Jasinski, 2288 North Long Lk.  
06-11-200-027, 028 & 029 Lilac Lane & Lilac Trail  
Preliminary and final site plan approval: the Lilacs  
Secretary Root reviewed the file. Karl Jasinski, 2288 North Long Lake sworn in.  
Chairman Tucker explained this is a unique situation because these lots are metes and bounds and are recorded tax parcels. When Jasinski approached the Township to obtain building permits, it was discovered that because this is a PUD, he still needs site plan approval. Jasinski presented the layout and renderings of the proposed homes. He the parcels have shared driveways as approved by the Commission when he reduced the number of units from 8 to 4. Jasinski noted the required grading plan is under review and asked for preliminary and final approval. In response to a question by Spees, Jasinski replied that the wetland on the property is regulated and a permit is in place. Spees noted the private drive was approved as part of the PUD. Richard asked if the drive had been reviewed by the Fire Chief, it was noted that a verbal approval had been given. Chairman Tucker called for audience comments. There were none.

Motion to grant preliminary and final site plan approval with the following conditions:  
- Grading plan shall be approved by the Township Engineer  
- Drive way access and emergency stub for turn-a-round for units 3 & 4 shall be approved by the Fire Chief  

Motion by: Root  
Seconded by: Ochodnicky  
Ayes: Carlson, Franz, Ochodnicky, Richard, Root, Spees, Tucker  
Nays: None  
Absent: None

Options for SP07-003  
The Planning Commission discussed options for the application by Capitol Realty for a two unit site condominium. They determined that the lot area is based on the area minus the road right-of-way. The ordinance requires lots without sewer to be a minimum of 1 acre. With the right-of-way excluded from the lot area, the proposed units do not meet the requirements of the ordinance, therefore the applicant must request a variance. Chairman Tucker called for audience comments. There were none. Applicant will apply to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance.

Land area & density calculations and requirements for minimum lot sizes:
Easements: The Commission decided that easements should not be located within the building envelop. They noted that this should be evaluated during site plan review.

Road Rights-of-Way: The Commission concluded the following amendments need to be made:
- Add the exclusion of road right-of-way to footnote h. in the schedule of regulations
- Amend definition of lot area to exclude road rights-of-way
- Cross reference lot area and lot, line front to one another
- Correct definition of lot line, front as follows:
  
  **Lot line, front** - In the case of an interior lot, abutting upon on public or private street, the front lot line shall mean the line separating such lot from such street right-of-way. In the case of a through lot, the front lot line shall be that line separating said lot from that street which is designated on the zoning permit. In the case of a corner lot, both street lot lines are front lot lines. **add cross reference to lot area**

Table 3-2 –Minimum Parcel Size: The Commission agreed this table should include a note that those minimum parcel sizes must have sewer

Appling Density to a Platted Lot Split: The Commission asked that the lot partition ordinance be revised and include standards for approval

Chairman Tucker called for audience comments on the above related items. There were none.

Roof Sign vs. Wall Sign: There was discussion about the difference between a wall sign and a roof sign. The ordinance defines a wall sign as a sign attached to or placed flat against the exterior wall surface of any building, no portion of which projects more than 12 inches from the wall. A roof sign is defined as a sign which is erected constructed and maintained upon and projects beyond the roof of the building. Piggott explained the ordinance prohibits roof signs because of health safety and welfare issues including access for firefighting, snow and wind load. He noted that a wall sign is affixed to the wall of the building which is part of the structure. Tucker stated concerns about the wall projecting above the roof. Franz stated this type of structure is not uncommon and that portion is considered part of the wall. Tucker said he felt allowing 50% of the wall face as signage is excessive. This will be addressed when the Commission reviews the draft of the sign ordinance.

The following items will be discussed at future workshops:
- Sight line as it relates to vacant property or a road
- Temporary Storage Shelters
- Subdivision control ordinance
- Lighting is the standard in the ordinance a minimum or maximum requirement
- Landscaping, several issues will be addressed as an overhaul of the landscape standards they are:
- Zoning Board of Appeals wants the Commission to take a look at 4.01c (Interpretation)
• Mechanism to require additional buffering of residential rear yards when along the Township right of ways
• Woodland protection, preservation of existing trees
• Reevaluate buffering between uses (sewer treatment plant)
• The Commission decided this will be handled by a committee including, Doug Shultz, Rowe Inc., Tucker, Zimmer, McDonald and Sharich.
• Citizen participation ordinance
• Open space agreement language, PUD agreements?
• Expiration of site plans Article 8.11
• Incorporate the Zoning Board of Appeals cases into the Zoning Ordinance
• Storm Water Information – Spees
• Economic Development – Richard

ADJOURN:
Meeting adjourned at 9:38 p.m.