

SAUGATUCK TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

March 7, 2005

The Saugatuck Township Planning Commission held a workshop meeting on March 7, 2005, at the township hall on Blue Star Highway, Saugatuck, Michigan 49453.

Present: Darpel, Hanson, Marczuk, Milauckas, Olendorf
Absent: Jarzembowski and Rausch
Also present: Observer reporter

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Milauckas at 6:20 P.M.

An outdoor lighting ordinance from Taos, NM was presented for consideration by Olendorf, who explained that the basic concept was lighting from “up to down.” Whether “lumens” or “foot candles” is used as a measure to describe brightness, Milauckas said a limit on aggregate brightness was needed in the ordinance. Darpel was concerned there were no exceptions for farm utility lighting for large parcels of acreage. The penalty section in this sample ordinance was deemed unnecessary because of Sec. 40-41 in the current Zoning Ordinance. Olendorf said he would send these ideas to Sisson and ask him to rework the ordinance.

The Commission discussed the March 4 memo from Jane Wright. It stated that the Township Board had denied all three recommended motions by the Planning Commission regarding moratoria, directed the P.C. away from a township-wide tree ordinance, and asked the P.C. to form a committee of interested community members to discuss possible tree ordinances. Milauckas will ask Wright or some other Board member to serve on the committee along with a few concerned citizens, said committee to meet with the P.C.

Sisson’s proposed Tree Protection Ordinance was discussed and a few possible changes suggested: Page 2, 1.01 C, add “retaining rural character;” Page 3, IB, include ROW, perhaps make the 40’ front yard buffer in the current Zoning Ordinance the measure, or make the “building line” the limit for retaining trees along the road; IC, remove the statement “The building footprint(s) plus a maximum area of twenty five feet surrounding the footprint.” There seemed to be consensus that beyond the front buffer of trees to be retained in commercial and industrial zones, only 20% of the lot should be cut before coming to the P.C. with a site plan.

Next the P.C. considered the proposed changes to the sign ordinance made by Hanson. He explained the need for limiting the size of for sale, for rent or sold signs placed by real estate agents. In Sec. 40-634 (f) it was decided that his additions did not need a definition of “billboard,” that all such signs would be limited to 32 s.f. and 10 feet in height, that no more than 3 billboards or off-premise signs shall be allowed in one linear mile, but that the restriction would not be affected by what exists in a neighboring township. It was also decided that no other signs except for those relating to one’s own business should be allowed on one’s site. Darpel thought that if a sign is not properly maintained, the owner should lose the right to display such sign, upon notification by the Z. A., and he thought there should be some provision for obsolescence. Changing signs should be prohibited. Milauckas thought the language should be clarified describing two-faced signs. Restrictions on temporary signs were deemed too lenient: 45 days in 6 months for tourist-related businesses, 14 days for everyone else, except only 7 days for portable signs were suggested. Hanson said he would rework his proposed additions. The recording secretary left the meeting at 9:00 P.M.

The township budget for planning and zoning was discussed. The meeting adjourned at 9:45 P.M. The next workshop meeting is scheduled for March 16 at 6:00 P.M. The next regular meeting is March 28 at 7:00 P.M.

Betty A. White, Recording Secretary

Sandy Rausch, Secretary