

**Peninsula Township Planning Commission  
Special Meeting Minutes 5:30 PM  
August 15, 2016**

Meeting called to order at 5:30 PM

Present: **Leak-Chair; Hornberger; Serocki; Peters; Couture**

Absent: **Wunsch**(excused), **Rosi** (excused)

Also present: *Michelle Reardon*, Director of Zoning and Planning; *Claire Schoolmaster*, Planning and Zoning Co-coordinator; *Leslie Sickterman*, McKenna Associates and *Mary Ann Abbott*, Recording Secretary.

**Approve Agenda**

**MOTION: Hornberger/Peters** to approve Agenda

**PASSED UNAN**

**Brief Citizens Comments- for items not on the Agenda**

None

**Conflict of Interest**

None

**Consent Agenda**

- a. Correspondence
- b. Minutes-July 18, 2015 Special Meeting

**Peters** correction to page two of minutes should read 800 **square** feet.

**MOTION: Hornberger/Peters** to approve consent agenda with changes to minutes.

**PASSED UNAN**

**New Business**

1. Peninsula Township Zoning Ordinance DRAFT: Sections 7.113, 7.114, 7.115, 7.116 and Articles 5 & 11 (Discussion)

*Reardon* began by informing the Commission that both the Township Attorney and Patrick Sloan, McKenna Associates had reviewed and submitted memos on Articles 5 and Articles 11. That information is included in tonight's packet.

The suggestion was made that the Commission begin tonight's review where they left off which is 7.113. *Leslie Sickterman* from McKenna Associates is present to assist with the review.

7.113 Accessory building discussion ended last time with discussion on the size of accessory building. Discussion was that 800 square feet was too small, and that perhaps it should be the same as the footprint of the house or smaller. **Leak** suggested that perhaps it could be written as a percentage of the principal residence. **Peters** stated that we also have lot coverage. Upon further discussion and reminders of the ZBA cases that were included in the packet staff recommends that Accessory Structure needs to be better defined. We need to determine that not only size but also how many accessory structures can be present on site.

Staff will review this issue again and focus on the definition of Accessory Building and the Commission can look at this at the Second Draft.

Discussion further on height restrictions and enforcement on second storage accessory structures.

7.114 Fences and walls is the next section to be covered. *Reardon* spoke on recent issues on retaining walls to assist with erosion that have been seen by ZBA. The ZBA has asked that we look at retaining walls differently. *Reardon* also stated that the other thing to think about is that the Planning Commission intent, ZBA intent and the Town Board confirms that privacy fences do potentially have a place here. There was discussion on responsibility for fence maintenance by the owner and the thought of recording of a document or at the least keeping a document in property files in the case of property changes.

**Reardon** will ask the Township Attorney if it would be beneficial to record such a document.

**Hornberger** asked if everyone was happy with the fence height of 6 foot. Consensus is to keep with a fence height of 6 feet.

**Schoolmaster** asked if a permit could be required for a retaining wall.

7.115 Swimming Pools brought discussion by the commission on fence requirements and the permit regulations, which are currently done at the County Level and will continue to be at that level

7.116 Accessory Solar Energy had a consensus by the Commission that ground mounted systems must meet setback compliance as a structure. Solar Power on a roof is new to the zoning ordinance and there is a question on how to calculate the coverage. There needs to be clarification on how to calculate this coverage. *Reardon* asked McKenna to provide clarification on height for ground mounted and also power sizes.

Commission would also like to discuss again the maximum building height in the zoning district related to Accessory Solar Energy. The commission would also like to discuss larger arrays in the Agricultural area. The Commission would like to strike section 2 unless McKenna can provide argument on why it should be included.

Article 11 Signs *Reardon* states that the Attorney has reviewed Article 11 and there have been edits by the Consultant. **Hornberger** would like to see a more complete copy in an acceptable form before they make a review and pick it apart. *Reardon* agrees that we should see the next draft and see what the attorney says on this issue.

Article 5 *Reardon* indicates that the both the Attorney and Consultant memos came in late in the day and that *Reardon* is not comfortable commenting at this time. **Serocki** really feels that we need to see significant standards listed in this section if we really want to preserve the natural character. **Serocki** would also like to have "open space" specifics all together.

**Peters** would have expected to see some symmetry in development between site condominium and planned unit developments. **Reardon** will look into this.

2. Updated ZO timeline (discussion)

Another 5:30 meeting will be set for August 22, 2016 on Article 2 and Article 6 and Zoning Map. At the end of that meeting we will look to see what still needs to be done.

#### **Citizen Comments**

None

#### **Board Comments**

**Peters** is looking at the schedule and is concerned that the Planning Commission will not be ready for a Public Hearing as listed on the schedule. *Reardon* suggests that McKenna lead us into how we proceed towards the Public Hearing. **Serocki** we need time to review the second draft and have a meeting of the Planning Commission to make sure these are the changes we wanted. **Peters** thinks the Planning Commission will need more work then this schedule allows. **Reardon** This is a schedule that was put out originally and we will check with McKenna on a new schedule.

**MOTION: Serocki/Reardon** to adjourn at 6:53PM

Respectfully submitted by Mary Ann Abbott, Recording Secretary