Pursuant to SB 1008, the Village of Spring Lake will conduct its business virtually to mitigate the spread of COVID-19.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Bohnhoff called the meeting to order at 7:11 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Bohnhoff, Johnson, VanderMeulen and Van Leeuwen-Vega,

Absent: Drooger, Garrison and Van Strate

3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Motion by Van Leeuwen-Vega, second from VanderMeulen to approve the agenda with a revision to fix a typographical error: changing the new business for the proposed text amendments to a public hearing. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 4 No: 0

4. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: October 27, 2020 meeting.

Motion by Van Leeuwen-Vega, second from Johnson, to approve the minutes from the October 27, 2020 regular meeting. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 4 No: 0

5. STATEMENTS OF CITIZENS – AGENDA ITEMS ONLY

There were no statements of citizens.

6. NEW BUSINESS

A. Proposed Text Amendment to Zoning Ordinance – Accessory Buildings, Exceptions for Low-Impact Projects, Maximum Height in the SFR District, and Waterfront Setbacks in the SFR and MFR Districts.

Chairman Bohnhoff, introduced this item and asked Hoisington to give an overview.

Hoisington explained that the Planning Commission has been working under the new Zoning Ordinance for a few months and have found sections that should be amended. Two of the
proposed amendments would amend sections based on discussion held by the Commissioners and the remaining items were recommendations by Village staff that were inadvertently left out of the new ordinance. The existing ordinance currently limits accessory buildings dependent on the presence of a garage. A recent discussion with Commissioners indicated a preference to limit the number of accessory buildings to two per property, including a detached garage. Currently, properties with a garage attached to the principal structure are entitled to a maximum of two detached accessory buildings. The total gross floor area of these buildings cannot exceed three hundred (300) square feet. Properties without an attached garage are entitled to a maximum of three detached accessory buildings. One of these buildings may be a detached garage with a maximum size of six-hundred and fifty (650) square feet in gross floor area. The other two buildings are entitled to a total gross floor area not to exceed three hundred (300) square feet, and neither building being more than one-hundred and fifty (150) square feet. Under the new proposed language all properties would have a maximum of two accessory buildings. Properties with an attached garage would still be entitled to the two buildings without change. The change would affect properties without an attached garage which would now be entitled to one detached garage up to six-hundred and fifty (650) square feet and one accessory building up to one-hundred and fifty (150) square feet in size. Staff discovered an issue with this proposed change. Property owners without an attached garage would be negatively impacted and no longer be entitled to the same amount of accessory building area or lot coverage. Comparatively, the current ordinance that allows for two accessory buildings in addition to a detached garage, resulting in an equal amount of building area and lot coverage. Staff has drafted language to reflect the proposed change in the attached draft zoning ordinance text amendment per the direction of the Planning Commission. However, staff cautions the Planning Commission to consider the implications of approving the amendment as is written. If the amendment were to be approved and included in the draft to the Village Council, staff would recommend against adoption. If the Planning Commission is still inclined to reduce the number of accessory buildings on a property, then Commissioners should consider reducing the number of accessory buildings a property with an attached garage is allowed. If the amendment is written to allow only one building at 150 sqft for a property with an attached garage, then it would be equal in area and lot coverage to properties with a detached garage.

Motion by Van Leeuwen-Vega, second from Johnson, to open the Public Hearing at 7:19 p.m. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 4 No: 0

There were no public comments.

Motion by Johnson, second from VanderMeulen, to close the Public Hearing at 7:21 p.m. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 4 No: 0

Johnson said that he agreed with Hoisington in regard to keeping consistency and equality within the properties. VanderMeulen also agreed. Van Leeuwen-Vega asked if this meant they would remove this section they had added. Hoisington said that that was one option.

Hoisington explained that the next amendment was based on previous discussion, staff believes the Planning Commission is inclined to amend Section 390-122.A to allow for flexibility over site design requirements for site plan review applications. For example, the Planning Commission heard an application for a project including a new shed on a commercial property. Because they are not exempt from site plan review this project is required to meet parking, landscaping, and
lighting requirements. At the time of this hearing the Planning Commission felt these requirements were a burden for such a minor project that was improving the site. The flexibility in the propose amendment would give the Planning Commission the discretion to waive certain site design requirements dependent on the project. Low impact projects would be eligible to have design requirements waived when the Planning Commission determines the requirements to be burdensome in comparison to the scope of work.

**Hoisington** explained that the next 2 amendments were SFR Height Maximum where the new ordinance limits the maximum height of a structure to 35 feet but does not define the maximum height in stories. This amendment would just clarify the maximum height to 35 ft or 2.5 stories, whichever is less, and the last proposed amendment was related to Waterfront Setbacks where the properties within the residential districts (SFR and MFR) are subject to altered setbacks if they are waterfront properties. The new ordinance needs to be amended to include a reference to Section 390.26.C to reflect this requirement.

Motion by **VanderMeulen**, second from **Johnson**, to recommend the Village Council approve the proposed zoning text amendment ordinance with the draft date of 11/20/2020 with the section regarding a proposed amendment to accessory buildings be removed from the draft. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 4  No: 0

7. **STATEMENTS OF CITIZENS – NON-AGENDA ITEMS ONLY**

Darcy Dye thanked the Planning Commission for doing this hard work virtually. Dye said she felt that not meeting in person put them at a disadvantage.

8. **COMMENTS OF PLANNING COMMISSIONERS**

**Hoisington** explained that there had been 2 short term rental applications removed from the agenda because there was no way they would have been able to meet the requirements of the Short-Term Rental Ordinance as written. Hoisington said that after staff reviewed and discussed the applications, they were inclined to allow them as a permitted use instead of a special use and exempt them from site plan review.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

Motion by **Johnson**, second from **Van Leeuwen-Vega**, the meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 4  No: 0

Cassandra Hoisington, Village Planner  Maryann Fonkert, Deputy Clerk