

# MINUTES Planning & Zoning Commission May 10, 2017

# 1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:06 pm by Chair M. Olson.

**Members Present:** Chair M. Olson, Vice Chair M. Willcoxen, P. Carlson, D. Carlson

Members Absent: J. Johnson, Supervisor C. Cagle

**Others Present:** Planner E. Maass, Town Clerk K. Wood, Two members of the

public (signed in)

# 2. <u>PUBLIC COMMENTS</u> (ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA)

None

### 3. ADOPT THE AGENDA

P. Carlson made a motion to adopt the agenda. M. Willcoxen seconds. All in favor, motion carried.

# 4. APPROVE THE MINUTES of the April 12, 2017 Planning Commission meeting

P. Carlson made a motion to approve the minutes of the April 12, 2017 Planning Commission meeting. D. Carlson seconds. All in favor, motion carried.

# 5. OLD BUSINESS

- a. Welschen Complaint 32450 Falcon Avenue Code Complaint
  - E. Maass presented his staff report and commented on the following:
    - Emails have been exchanged between S. Welschen and Staff
    - The property owner wanted a pole building but was denied due to there being no primary structure on the land
    - S. Welschen is interested in combining his two parcels of land
    - He is in violation of Township code regarding outside storage

Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting May 10, 2017 Page 1 of 6



• A site visit should be done to verify the scope of the violations

The complaintant believes someone is staying overnight on the property and he hears loud noises very late at night. He told M. Olson that he can view the property from his or his mother's land at any time.

- P. Carlson said that a violation letter should be sent right away.
- D. Wade noted that there are some expired license plates on the property.
- E. Maass read Lent Township's ordinance regarding outside storage.
- D. Wade said, "None of the stuff on the property is owned by the property owner. It is owned by people who lease the land".
- M. Olson is going to walk the complaintant's property tomorrow with P. Carlson.
- E. Maass is going to send a letter tomorrow to the property owner.
- M. Olson is going to give him 15 days from tomorrow (Thursday, May 11) to clean it up.

# 6. <u>NEW BUSINESS</u>

#### a. Welschen CUP

The property owner has a sign advertising a business but does not have a CUP on file. E. Maass is going to send a letter for the sign violation as well.

#### b. 4.08 Accessory Structures and Uses – Boxed Eaves

- M. Olson has had at least three requests to be exempt from putting boxed eaves on an accessory structure addition. This is an added expense that M. Olson feels is unnecessary. He believes the Township should do a text amendment to exclude pole barns from requiring boxed eaves if they are located behind the home. Building Inspector, J. Kramer has received many complaints about this issue as well.
- M. Olson said that one of the residents he spoke to is in the RR2 and according to the ordinance he would have boxed eaves only on the new half of his pole barn which does not make sense to him. He does not feel that property owners should be required to do boxed eaves if the accessory structure is located behind the house.



- M. Willcoxen said that the properties in the RR1 and Urban Growth are smaller and should look nice.
- E. Maass confirmed that there are no boxed eave requirements in RRA. RR1 and Urban growth require them. E. Maass said that the section should be re-worded.
- M. Willcoxen said that he would not have a problem with RR2 not needing boxed eaves.
- D. Carlson said they should define what a boxed eave is. He said that there should not be a gray area left up to J. Kramer.
- P. Carlson said that at one time the ordinance used to require them only if it was visible from the street.
- E. Maass suggested that it says that they are not required to do boxed eaves if the building is behind the rear most wall of the home in the RRA and RR2.
- D. Carlson said there are people who would put an agricultural building one foot behind the house to avoid boxed eaves. He said that the measurements should be defined.
- P. Carlson said it should be 50' behind the home.
- D. Carlson said this is giving them the option to not do the boxed eaves if it is 50' behind the home and it gives the land owner options.
- M. Olson said 50' is too far.
- P. Carlson disagrees with M. Olson because he believes 50' is not unfair to ask.
- M. Olson said that he wants to look at all the variables.
- M. Willcoxen said that the back line of the house should work.
- D. Carlson said that he can accept that.
- M. Olson said that they need to look at Urban Growth and RR1.
- M. Olson said that the people complaining about this need some answers.



P. Carlson said that if there is an existing building, they should not have to put eaves on the addition.

An addition should match what they have said D. Carlson. He said from a common sense standpoint, keep the boxed eaves as is.

- D. Carlson said someone should not have to do boxed eaves on an existing structure because it may be a hardship. He said that there is nothing in the ordinance that differentiates between new construction and additions.
- E. Maass said if it is front of the home eaves are required. In RR2 and properties that are less than 5 acres boxed eaves are required no matter if it is in front of the home or behind it. In the RRA boxed eaves will be required if it is in the front of the home.
- M. Willcoxen said that boxed eaves should be required if it is in front of the home no matter where the property is located.
- E. Maass suggested a public hearing regarding boxed eaves at the June 14<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission meeting.

#### c. Center Line Addition to Setbacks

M. Olson said they had a resident who is putting an addition on his house and it does not say from the center line in our ordinances. It should say 73' from the center line. E. Maass looked and it does say "minimum setbacks from center line". K. Wood is going to highlight it so that it is easier to see.

#### d. Hildreth Shed

The property owner's uncle/roommate bought the shed without getting a permit. R. Hildreth submitted a permit application. The shed is 12' x 32' and has a front porch on it. J. Kramer said that he does not feel that this can be approved according to the Town ordinances.

- E. Maass said the State requires 200 square feet to have a permit. It is State building code and we have to go along with it.
- M. Willcoxen asked if he was within the setbacks. P. Carlson said it is on blocks so he could move it. He said if he meets the setbacks and builds a proper foundation it has potential for approval.
- E. Maass said they would have to inspect the actual use of this shed. E. Maass said that if a building permit is not approved, the structure has to be removed.

Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting May 10, 2017 Page 4 of 6



- M. Olson is going to get ahold of J. Kramer tomorrow.
- E. Maass said that this is an accessory building.
- P. Carlson said there is a rental term of 36 months on the paperwork the homeowner submitted. That could mean a number of things. He asked, "How do we know what the use is?" He said that it implies that someone is living it.
- M. Olson said he is going to do a site visit and give J. Kramer a call.

# 7. COMMISSIONER/TOWN BOARD REPORT

None

# 8. <u>NEXT REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING IS JUNE 14, 2017 AT 7:00 PM.</u>

# 9. ADJOURN

M. Willcoxen mad	le a motion to adjourn	the meeting at 8:3	35 pm. D.	Carlson second	ls. All
in favor, motion ca	arried.				

Mike Olson, Chair	Kelly Wood, Clerk	_