

## SAUGATUCK TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

May 16, 2005

The Saugatuck Township Planning Commission held a workshop meeting on May 16, 2005, at the township hall on Blue Star Highway, Saugatuck, Michigan 49453.

Present: Darpel, Hanson, Jarzembowski, Marczuk(arrived at 8:30), Milauckas, Olendorf and Rausch

Absent: None

Also present: Jim Schmiechen

Chairman Milauckas called the meeting to order at 7:08 P.M. Jarzembowski made a motion to approve the May 10 minutes, and Olendorf seconded. The motion carried.

The Commissioners revisited “Commercial, Office and Institutional Architecture—C-1, C-2, C-3 Zone,” and Jarzembowski introduced Jim Schmiechen, who wrote “Raising the Roof” and was part of a team who put together “Building the New and Rehabilitating the Old, a Builder’s and Owner’s Guide,” both books relating specifically to architecture in the Saugatuck-Douglas area. Milauckas explained that the Commission would like help coming up with language to describe the characteristics of local architecture for this proposed Ordinance. Schmiechen said he felt language was not his strong point and he was not a purist when it comes to architecture. He added that trying to translate the older characteristics of local architecture to modern usage was difficult. He pointed out that originally most of the buildings were of wood. They discussed various buildings in the area, some controversial styles, some which caused a lot of frustration in the Commission, but Milauckas summarized that the Planner and Attorney will be able to work from the Commission’s key descriptive phrases to find specific, concrete terms which will be enforceable. Darpel pointed out that this example of an ordinance was provided by Planner Sisson and came from Grand Haven.

In Part 2 the Commissioners decided to substitute “shall” for “are encouraged to submit or.” In Part 3 A the Commissioners substituted for the last half of the sentence “a uniqueness of design that favors residential aspects, modest in style, and blends into the natural forested setting of the rural township.” And added “Applicants are encouraged to research local architecture in (the books mentioned above).” In Part 3 B the Commissioners decided to begin the list of building materials with “wood siding” and delete “or wood with an opaque or semi-transparent stain, or bleaching oil.” They also deleted subsections C and D, added “appropriate” to H after “Buildings shall provide,” and deleted “towers.” In M they added “residential” before “scale features.” They relettered Part 3 appropriately. The Industrial Architecture—I 1 Zone section was modified to coincide with Parts 2 and 3B, and references to multiple family residential architecture were deleted. Darpel said he wanted to include the requirement for detailed architectural perspectives or artistic renderings of perspectives early in the site plan process, and he would discuss with Sisson where it should go.

The Commissioners then turned to Accessory Buildings Sec. 40-631 for amendments suggested by Planner Sisson in a draft designated as 19-24-04. They decided to add (5) suggested by Sisson but revised it by adding “except for lots that exceed 150 feet in length of road frontage on the road where the driveway is proposed” and included “unless authorized by the Planning Commission for a use authorized as special approval use under Subsection (7).” Subsection (5) was replaced by Sisson’s suggestions and renumbered (6). It was understood that these provisions would supercede the definition of “garage, private” and the accessory building provisions in the individual R-1, R-2 and R-3 zoning ordinances. The new introductory paragraph of

Subsection (7) was accepted also, and Subsection (7) becomes (8). Hanson will reorganize this proposed ordinance.

Milauckas brought up a letter he has written to the township board regarding a newspaper article about the costs of planner and attorney help to the Planning Commission, and showed the billing amounts for both so far this fiscal year. He suggested the charges in the paper are incorrect, and he awaits a response to his letter.

Olendorf presented the idea of allowing accessory buildings to be used for dwelling units in cases where older residents want to stay on their property which they share with their children, or vice versa, to discourage tear-downs or additions which jeopardize the architectural integrity of the existing home. Standards would include a limit on size and number on one lot, a requirement that the accessory building be in the proximity of the living envelope of the existing residence and be compatible in style with the main residence, a requirement that it could not be a manufactured mobile home, that it could not be rented (written into the deed), and that it would share the electrical meter with the main residence. He admitted he had a personal reason for suggesting such a provision. Sisson had provided a possible ordinance along these lines, and consensus was he would be asked to rewrite it with these ideas.

The lighting ordinance is awaiting Sisson's lumens requirements.

Meeting adjourned at 10:20 P.M. The next regular meeting is May 23 at 7:00 P.M.

---

Betty A. White, Recording Secretary

---

Sandy Rausch, Secretary

### **MOTIONS**

1. Motion by Jarzembowski/Olendorf to approve May 10 minutes.