

## SAUGATUCK TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

February 20, 2008

The Saugatuck Township Planning Commission held a workshop on February 20, 2008, at the township hall on Blue Star Highway, Saugatuck, Michigan 49453.

Present: Edris, Hanson, Milauckas and Rowe  
Absent: Darpel, Jarzembowski and Rausch  
Also present: Planner Mark Sisson

At 4:00 P.M. Chairman Hanson opened the workshop with the question of when the May meeting will be, since the fourth Monday falls on Memorial Day. Wednesday, the 28<sup>th</sup> was suggested, to be confirmed later. Minutes were waived until the next meeting.

Hanson opened discussion of the anti-funneling ordinance, using the proposed amendment to Article XII by Planner Sisson, dated January 22, 2008. Sisson presented three questions: (1) Do you want to legitimize and regulate access to a lake or waterway via an occupied residential piece of property as an accessory use? (2) Do you want to allow access to a waterway through a free-standing piece of property, where there is no residence, as a private park or commercial enterprise perhaps, through membership? (3) Do you want to allow free-standing or contiguous pieces of property which are open space to a development such as a site condo to act as access to a waterway for those homes involved, or even to be used for access by a membership of those not involved in the site condo. Sisson said his proposed amendment is aimed at the last scenario.

Sisson explained that there is the possibility through Land Division for someone to divide off, say, 25 feet of his property for an easement to neighbors to access the Lake. The resulting lot would be stamped unbuildable, but there is no provision for such accessory use now in any residentially zoned district, and therefore, that use cannot be regulated.

Discussion of question (2) above revealed the concern for enforcement of regulations and the possibility of decreased value for surrounding properties.

Lot width on the waterfront in relation to width on the road, whether accessory use should be from an easement in addition to required lot width, and parking provisions were discussed. At Rowe's suggestion, subsections a and b proposed for Section 40-910 would reflect an adjustment to the regulation for minimum lot width to require that the waterfront lot width be no less than 90% of the minimum lot width on the road frontage.

Milauckas questioned the first definition in the proposed amendment because "Shared Waterfront Property Ownership" does not appear anywhere else in the ordinance. Edris suggested adding "for the purpose of waterfront access."

Sisson explained that subsection c requires that any new parcel created for the purpose of shared waterfront access must be at least 100 feet in width, and that is where the table of increments begins, at 100 feet of water front.

Dockage requirements, and whether they should coincide with this proposed waterfront access amendment, and whether river frontage should be more densely used than Lake frontage, were discussed.

Hanson reported that the Joint Planning Committee urges Township support for a Harbor Commission, that it wants the individual planning commissions to compare their ordinances with the Tri-Community Plan and note any non-conformity, that the Joint Planning Committee wants the individual planning commissions to share key draft documents with the other jurisdictions, and that in August the Committee will discuss creating a Joint Planning Commission and other consolidations of community services.

Workshop adjourned at 6:05 P.M. The next regular meeting is February 25 at 7:00 P.M.

---

Betty A. White, Recording Secretary

---

Sandra Rausch, Secretary