



# Wexford Joint Planning Commission

% Cherry Grove Township  
 4830 E. M-55

Cadillac, Michigan 49601-9332

(231)775-1138x6

[planningandzoning@wexfordjpc.org](mailto:planningandzoning@wexfordjpc.org) | [www.wexfordjpc.org](http://www.wexfordjpc.org)

## Draft Minutes

**Time, date:** 6:30pm, Monday, August 24, 2020

**Meeting location:** Wexford County Road Commission meeting room, 85 West Highway M-115, Boon, Michigan. Coordinates: 44° 19' 32.5" N, 85° 34' 53.4" W (44.325685, -85.581500)

**A. Call to order, roll call, and Pledge of Allegiance.**

The regular meeting of the Wexford Joint Planning Commission was called to order at 6:30 pm - the Pledge of Allegiance was recited; roll call showed that members: Schroeder, Osborne, Bigelow, Harvey, Monroe, Redes, Taylor, and Kastl were present constituting a quorum of the 11 member commission to conduct business.

**B. Matters pertaining to citizens present at the meeting, in the following order:**

None

**C. Public Comment**

A member of the public spoke regarding the proposed accessory building language stating that language regarding storage of other items should not be included.

**D. Housekeeping business.**

**1. Consent Business.**

**a. Approval of July 27, 2020 Minutes**

Member Harvey made a motion (seconded by Osborne) to approve the minutes of the July 27, 2020 meeting of the Wexford Joint Planning Commission. Being no discussion the motion was approved unanimously.

**b. Approval of Commission's expense report (pay the bills)**

Member Osborne made a motion (seconded by Harvey) to approve the expense report / pay the bills of the Wexford Joint Planning Commission. Being no discussion the motion was approved unanimously.

**2. Treasurer's budget report – Donna Taylor**

Treasurer Taylor brought to the attention of the WJPC that the \$625.00 quarterly administrative fee to Cherry Grove Township had been deducted and that the commission members have not been paid their June 2020 per diem and that this will be corrected and paid with the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter (July / August / September) member pay. Member Osborne made a motion (seconded by Redes) to approve the Treasurers report. Being no discussion the motion was approved unanimously.

**3. Planning and Zoning Report – Robert Hall**

ZA Hall presented a brief oral report in lieu of the regular written report. It was reported that office activity had remained steady throughout the month in light of the fact that certain COVID restrictions were in place. Hall reported that he was working (and coordinating with planner Grobbel) on publicizing two consecutive master plan workshops for the public in late September; one that would focus on public input for the zoning plan and another that would explore the possibility of sub-plans for the participating municipalities.

**E. Unfinished business and reports (items considered here are taken up in the same order as established by the Commission to fix a priority for consideration and work done in the planning office).**

**1. ‘Proposed’ Accessory Building / Structure language review**

**a. (from July 27<sup>th</sup> public hearing)**

Commission Chair Schroeder began the discussion by providing personal insight into the situation in his subdivision on Lake Gitchegumee in Hanover Township by exclaiming that ‘accessory’ buildings on lots without homes are already inundating the lake area. He continued by explaining the impact that regulating size and placement has on the smaller lots in subdivisions in general and in particular to views in the vicinity of lakes.

Member Monroe stated that her concern was that of the size of a building in relationship to the size of the lot and that some type of proportional system should be in place. She also explained that the Zoning Board of Appeals functions to address the more peculiar issues if and when they arise.

Member Harvey asked for clarification regarding residential zoning versus an actual zoning district. It was explained by staff that any district could allow residential structures (hence, residential zoning) and that a zoning district was defined by its physical boundaries; each with its own particular uses listed, such as a residential dwelling / house.

Staff described experiences in other municipalities and that there was concern regarding the actual definitions of ‘accessory’; accessory to ‘what’ if nothing else exists on otherwise vacant property? A general consensus among the membership was that a definition for a ‘storage building’ should be added to distinguish the differences and that perhaps the use; that of a storage building (on vacant land) be added to the list of uses permitted in the affected zoning districts.

Member Harvey added that he also had concerns with the proposed language in 1072.E.1 and encroachments into setbacks versus lot sizes. Staff suggested to the commission that it may be possible to amend the ordinance in a fashion that would allow the ZA to grant a dimensional setback variance at a specified percentage / dimension based up a defined set of standards and that this could help alleviate the necessity to seek a variance in certain instances. Staff also mentioned that this administrative variance should not be used in the R1 and R2 districts where there are already built-in deviations based on lot sizes.

The Commission continued discussions and focused on accessory buildings in the front yard. The Commission seemed to form a consensus that the more rural settings should provide flexibility and setbacks designed to reflect the character of the specific zoning district, and is generally ‘okay’ with accessory / storage buildings in the front yard.

Member Monroe again expressed concern about the size of a building in relationship to the size of the lot and that some type of proportional system should be in place.

Member Kastl stated that setbacks for accessory buildings were not relevant if setback far off the road.

The Commission concluded their discussions by directing staff to rewrite and submit a new document for review based up these comments.

Chair Schroeder informed the Commission members that we had exceeded our meeting time as specified in the bylaws.

**2. Additional meetings (as needed)**

The Commission Chair commented that any additional meetings could be conducted on a case by case basis as they progress through the Master Plan.

**3. Training Video**

Due to time constraints, the training video was not presented.

**F. New business (other business and communications).**

None

**G. Public Comment**

A member of the public spoke in favor of supporting more diverse freedom in utilizing land - also expressed confusion about zoning district standards - unlimited sizes will create revenue for townships.

**H. Adjournment.**

Member Harvey made a motion (seconded by Osborne) to adjourn. After a unanimous voice vote, the meeting adjourned at 8:44 pm.

**Respectfully submitted by Robert Hall - Staff on behalf of:**

---

**Beverly Monroe - WJPC Secretary**