

ALAMO TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Held at
Alamo Township Fire Hall
7840 North 6th Street.
Kalamazoo Michigan 49009
May 2, 2017

Meeting Called to Order: Chairman Patrick Studabaker called the meeting to order with the Pledge of Allegiance at 7:08 PM.

Roll Call of Commissioners: Chairman Patrick Studabaker, Commissioner Dick Bennett, Commissioner Pauline Keiser, Commissioner John Kennedy, Commissioner Don Porter, and Secretary Belden Smith were present. Chair Studabaker asked to excuse Commissioner Rebecca Harvey, on basis of her prior notification to him. Motion was made by P. Studabaker, seconded by P. Keiser, to excuse R Harvey. Motion passed on voice vote without opposition.

Others Present: Dan Scheffers, and Township Zoning Board of Appeals member Al Sweitzer.

Amendment to the Agenda: Chair Studabaker asked to insert an informal discussion with D. Scheffers. A motion to amend the agenda was later made by B. Smith and supported by D. Porter. Motion carried by voice vote.

Approval of Meeting Minutes: P. Studabaker wished to be identified by name as the voice opposing an amendment to the motion made by R. Harvey at the April 4, 2017 meeting.

D. Bennett moved to approve the minutes of April 4, 2017 with the noted addition. D. Porter supported the motion. The motion was carried by voice vote, without objection.

Informal Discussion: D. Scheffers inquired about Permitted and Special Uses and regulations regarding Uses in the various districts wherein a residence may be established. No official action was taken or proposed. He and Chair Studabaker will continue discussion with Zoning Administrator and Building Official K. Cardiff.

Old Business

a. Trucking and Freight Operations In I-3 Zone:

Having held a Public Hearing on this issue as part of the April Planning Commission meeting, **P. Studabaker made a motion to recommend the addition of "Trucking and Freight Operations" as a permitted Use in Section 5.12, the Industrial-3 district. Motion supported by D. Porter.** Whether there was a need for further definition of terms was discussed, but Chair Studabaker assured commissioners that Attorney C. Kaufman had approved of this simple addition of language.

On a roll call vote, commissioners voted as follows:

| | |
|----------------------|------------|
| P. Studabaker | Yes |
| D. Porter | Yes |
| J. Kennedy | Yes |
| P. Keiser | Yes |
| D. Bennett | Yes |
| B. Smith | Yes |

Motion passed

b. Deferred Parking:

The idea of incorporating "deferred parking" as an option available to business property owners in site plan preparation was first brought up at the December 2016 Planning Commission (PC) Meeting.

At the January 2017 meeting, the following language was approved by voice vote for presentation at a Public Hearing, which was to be part of the regular February 2017 PC meeting.

8.1(5) - Deferred parking

1) If the parking spaces required by Section 8.1(4) can be demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Planning Commission are determined by the owner or the applicant to be in excess of the immediate parking need for parking, the Planning Commission may approve a lesser amount of parking, based upon request of the property owner or applicant as shown on an approved site plan. If the Planning Commission determines that some or all of the deferred parking spaces are needed, these spaces must be installed. Any person aggrieved by this determination may appeal to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

2) Alterations to the deferred parking area to add parking spaces may be initiated by the owner or required by the Planning Commission, based on parking needs, and shall require the submission and approval of an amended site plan.

After Public Hearing at the February 2017 PC meeting, exact language was again opened for discussion. A revised draft of the Deferred Parking provision was introduced by P. Studabaker, and read as follows:

(5) deferred Parking

a. Where an applicant/owner/occupant demonstrates that parking requirements for a proposed use would be excessive, the Planning Commission may defer some (add%?) of the parking, provided the site plan designates areas of the site for future construction of the required spaces.

b. Areas reserved for future parking shall be maintained in a landscaped appearance and shall not be used for building area, storage or other accessory use.

c. Construction of the deferred parking area to add parking spaces may be initiated by the owner or required by the Township based on parking needs or observation, and shall require (administrative or Planning Commission) approval of an amended plan."

Discussion focused on part c. of this draft. However, the issue was tabled pending more work on the draft.

At the March 2017 meeting a motion was passed (on a roll call vote) to omit paragraph b. of the revised draft.

Discussion then moved to Paragraph c. and the mechanism for initiating development of the deferred area, when and if necessary (Administrative or Commission.) No consensus regarding this or regarding the allowable percent of deferment in Paragraph a. was arrived at.

While on the April agenda the issue was again tabled for lack of time.

At this, the May 2017 meeting, motion was made by **B. Smith to place the responsibility for requiring needed development of parking space(s) in a deferred area, on the Planning Commission. Motion supported by P. Studabaker.**

On a roll call vote Commissioners voted as follows:

| | |
|----------------------|------------|
| P. Keiser | Yes |
| J. Kennedy | Yes |
| D. Bennett | Yes |
| P. Studabaker | Yes |
| B. Smith | Yes |
| D. Porter | Yes |

Motion Passed

Unfortunately, no attention was given to the other unresolved detail of the draft language - that being the allowable percentage of ordained parking space requirement which can (on demonstration, by an applicant, of unnecessary excess) be "deferred" in the original site plan.

Never the less, **motion was made by P. Studabaker and supported by B. Smith to recommend to the Township Board of Trustees, adoption of the draft language with the PC option adopted at this meeting.**

On a roll call vote Commissioners voted as follows

| | |
|----------------------|------------|
| P. Studabaker | Yes |
| P. Keiser | Yes |
| B. Smith | Yes |
| D. Porter | Yes |
| j. Kennedy | Yes |
| D. Bennett | Yes |

The flawed **motion passed** but will surely need to be modified at a future meeting.

Old Business continued

Part c. Section 8.10(2) - minor changes, and Part d. Article 7 - Maximum Building or Structure Height:

As was the case earlier (see March 2017 minutes) the Commission decided to table discussion of both until Alamo Township Building Official and Zoning Administrator Kevin Cardiff can attend.

e. Updating Zoning Map with I-3 Zoning:

At the February 2017 meeting, it appeared to commissioners that the Alamo Township Master Plan (previously known as the Alamo Township Land Use Plan) does not support a rezoning (or perhaps even a conditional rezoning) allowing business uses in Section 24 of the Township, as was recommended to the Township Board of Trustees at that time. Subsequent examination of the Master Plan as reviewed and revised in 2010 revealed, on page eleven (11) under **Analysis and Future Plans** the following:

Commercial and Industrial (Provide for commercial and industrial development as driven by the needs of the community).

The [existing] objectives remain relevant but impractical for the long-term sustainability of the Township due to the limited amount of land available for [commercial and industrial] development. The 131/D Avenue corridor has long been designated the commercial center of and gateway into the Township. Capitalizing on land not currently developed and hidden from view provides an opportunity for sustainability while preserving the rural nature of the township.

Add objective: Designate the easternmost portion of Section 24 (west of 131) from E Avenue to D Avenue to encourage the development of commercial and industrial.

This language clearly supports the recommendation made by the Planning Commission at the February 2017 meeting and the subsequent Conditional Rezoning adopted by Township Board of Trustees at their February 13th meeting.

New Business: none

Citizen Comments: it was observed that the Planning Commission agenda has not been posted on the Township Website recently, prior to the regular monthly meetings.

Commissioner Comments:

It was noted that the February 2, 2017 unintentional failure to strike and omit the words "used for retail sales" in the motion to recommend revision to Section 8.1(c) was treated as a typographical error and corrected by Attorney C. Kaufman.

Adjourn: At 8:25 PM P. Keiser made a motion to adjourn the meeting. D. Bennett supported the motion. The motion carried without objection.

Respectfully submitted
Belden Smith, Secretary

DRAFT