

**VILLAGE OF ONEKAMA PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**  
**DATE: NOVEMBER 11, 2015**

The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Bonnie Miller at 1:07 p.m.

Present: Bonnie Miller, Sandy Beauvais, Ceceilia Heubener, Rudy Milasich, Alice Hendricks and Zoning Administrator, Bob Hall

Public Comment: None

Education Video: Linking Economy to Planning (15 minutes)

- Merging secondary to need and to economy (attract talent) with Placemaking
- Where to put specific businesses, residences, manufacturing, parks etc.
- Need to be quality places
- Work with other communities
- Quality of life important
- Northern Michigan needs to work together with stakeholders and governments to pool resources
- Need a vision to go beyond Your Area and reach out.
- Economy has changed to Global Community and need to work with neighbors
- Talent here in northern Michigan is different due to early retirees with their education and experience
- Use internet for information regarding the US
- What should Planning Commission's do? – Not roll over. Look at plan and ask if it will draw new businesses, infrastructure.
- Quality attracts quality
- Review regional plans to see if it meets our plans.

Minutes of October 14, 2015

A motion by Heubener, second by Beauvais, to approve the minutes as corrected to remove Miller at training session. Motion carried.

Amend Agenda

Add, new sign on Rt. 22

Miller asked about the size and bright "flashing lights" on sign erected by Trinity Lutheran Church and Onekama Marina on Rt. 22.

Milasich noted a need to review/revise 1015 B in the Zoning Ordinance. Ask the ZBA if the sign a non-conformity. It is lighted, bright and changing message. Less lumens and a slower message would be an improvement. There were ~~questions~~ questions regarding the safety factor of the large, bright sign with fast moving messages. Suggestions to revise ordinance 1015 A 3 and other factors regarding lighted signs, free standing, moving messages for the future.

Old Business

It was suggested we look at the **Township's ordinance regarding impervious surfaces.**

**1017 A.1. Milasich presented the committee with the following suggestion revisions regarding Impervious Surfaces.**

The Village ZO Section 1017 A.1 mandates that for every parcel in the Village "the percentage of the total land area of a parcel covered by impervious surfaces shall not exceed thirty-five percent (35%)...." ~~A 60%~~ A 60% impervious surface coverage exception is provided in Section 1017 A.2, for certain parcels which are within the Commercial Residential District but which are outside of the Portage Lake Overlay Zone. The parcels covered by the exception are Commercial Residential District parcels which are both located on the non-lake side of M22 and do not have their primary use "a single family dwelling, duplex, or multiple family dwellings."

Section 1021.B.7 arguably conflicts with Section 1017.A.1 because it allows up to 60% of the total land area to be covered by impervious surfaces for an existing motel structure located within the Commercial Residential District which is converted into permanently separated dwelling units. Section 1021.B.7 states: "The percentage of the total land area of the subject covered by impervious surfaces shall not exceed sixty percent (60%)" Milasich noted that the word "parcel" should be included after "subject".

Milasich suggested the apparent conflict could be corrected in different ways:

- A. By deleting Sec. 1021.B.7 which would leave the impervious surface coverage limitation of Section 1017 A 2 because they are "multiple family dwellings."
- B. By deleting Sec.1021.B.7, Section 1017.A.2 and deleting the exception language of Sec. 1017.A.1.
- C. By rewording the exception language of Section 1017.A.1. to include Section 1021.B.7. as follows:

"Section 1017.A.1.  
The percentage of the total land area of a parcel covered by impervious surfaces shall not exceed thirty-five percent (35%), except for a parcel covered by Section 1017.A.2 or Section 1021.B.7."

1021 B 7 Commission members had concerns about water runoff into the lake with new structures as indicated in the ordinance. Look at revising site plan for commercial development. Define impervious and foot print. Milasich will come back with impervious surface suggested definition.

No action taken. Members wanted more time to consider possibilities.

**Accessory Building Height Maximums.** Milasich presented the committee with the following suggestion: On 25 foot lots or lake lots an accessory building/structure can be 6 1/2 feet tall. At the October meeting the committee members consensus was that "buildings should or may be placed on 25 foot lots on the lake, a building that fits within the setbacks and is 5 feet tall.

The following information was provided by Milasich:

1006 "no structure or part thereof shall be erected or altered to a height exceeding thirty-five (35) feet" ...page 10-2 in ZO.

1011 C D states that the height of an Accessory Building to a Dwelling "shall not be more than ten feet (10) in height measured from the floor to the top plate..." (20 feet on parcels => 2 acres) (10-4).

1012 D states that the height of an Accessory Building to a principal building shall not exceed the height of the principal building or thirty-five feet, whichever is less. (p.10-4 in ZO)

The result is that an Accessory Building on a parcel with a Dwelling located within the Portage Lake Overlay Zone is governed by Sec. 1012 C or 10 feet from the floor to tip plate. Where the temporary dock is the principal structure on a nonconforming lot of record, the 35 feet height limit of Sec. 1006 currently applies. The proposed amendment would impose a 6.5 feet height limit for an Accessory Building on a nonconforming lot of record where the principal structure is a temporary seasonal dock.

Milasich suggested:

**Amend Sec. 7004 "Regulations and Standards"** by adding a new Subsection G: An accessory Building located on a nonconforming lot of record on which a the principal structure is a temporary seasonal dock shall not exceed six and one-half (6.5) feet in height measured from the ground to the highest point of the roof and shall be secured to the ground at each corner using either screw-in soil anchors and ties or a minimum of 4x4 inch untreated posts 18 inches deep and well secured to the Accessory Building.

Discussion followed without any consensus. More study and consideration by members needed.

#### Setbacks on Lake Lots

Also questions about revising the ordinance to change the side setbacks on lake lots from 10 feet to 5 feet. No decision made at the meeting in October.

#### Other

During discussion of The proposed amendment would impose a 6.5 feet height limit for an Accessory Building on a nonconforming lot of record where the principal structure is a temporary seasonal dock, it was noted that most docks and posts to anchor accessory buildings are usually treated with chemicals as are utility poles.

No Master Plan work session is scheduled for December.

Next meeting: December 9 art 12 noon in the Library.

Meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Alice E. Hendricks