

other farm equipment are currently only allowed in B-4 General Intensive Commercial district. This has been flagged as a discussion question by the Township. Is the Township interested in allowing sale lots in other districts or specific areas? (For reference, it is currently a use permitted under special conditions with a number of conditions to be met).

Discussion about added landscaping and expanding car lot sales to B-3 zoning. The types of dealerships and the future of car lots were discussed. The consensus is to leave it like it is. Car lot sales only in the B-4 district.

2. **Missing Middle Housing**—Where and how, and in what ways, would the Township like to facilitate missing middle housing? Discussion about the housing shortage. Duplex, 4-plex, rental housing, condos, side by sides. Experts are saying it will take up to 20 years to catch up. The ordinance needs to have some flexibility. An option would be to make it a permitted use and apply design standards. Also, be able to review by the Planning Commission under a certain number of units- administratively, and higher number of units-site plan review. Developers prefer zoning that is predictable. Focus on the quality, not the legal process. Consensus is we are open for some flexibility in the ordinance for certain commercial areas/districts with missing middle housing.
3. **Commercial Outdoor Storage**—What changes would the Township like to see regarding the standards for commercial outdoor storage? Outdoor display vs storage was discussed. Outdoor storage is not allowed without a principle use on the parcel. Screening was discussed. Due to these rules we don't have any contractor establishments in the township. A licensed trailer associated with the business isn't allowed right now. It is a big issue for Code Enforcement. It would be nice to be able to allow some storage with conditions (administrative approval). Consensus is we need to make some changes for limited allowance primarily for a trailer when placed in a non-visible location.
4. **B-1 District**—What additional uses would the Township like to see or consider allowing in the B-1? Are there uses that the Township would like the conditions? Is the Township interested in allowing limited retail uses (i.e. small shops, 1,000-2,000 square feet) in the B-1 District? B-1 is technically called neighborhood commercial-Neighbor business. There are too many limitations in B-1 zoning. The consensus is to make B-1 more flexible along main corridors, and also to consider restricting uses in B-2. We need to focus on the use and add conditions. Carmen will put something together based on the types of uses and what it is abutting.
5. **Climate Resiliency & Adaptability**—The Township has identified climate resiliency and adaptability as a consideration to be included in the updated Ordinance. What are some of the main concerns with both adaptability and resiliency and key ways the Township would like to see this reflected in the Zoning Ordinance? (i.e. ways to promote resiliency include encouraging the use of green infrastructure, allowing & encouraging renewable energy, strengthening economic resilience by supporting and encouraging local businesses, protection natural resources, etc.) This is green infrastructure, solar and electric cars. We need to look into abandonment of the solar equipment. Consensus the township is open to the idea to green infrastructure.

6. **Accessory Structures**—Would the Township like to see different standards for accessory structures depending on district or lot size? i.e. Agricultural land. The current ordinance allows size and number of accessory structures permitted based on lot size (with fixed sizes of structures per lot size). Some communities allow size of accessory structures based on lot coverage standards, in which they are a percentage of the total lot size (i.e. buildings may cover 25% of the lot, total impervious surface may cover 35% of the lot). This allows for larger lots to have larger buildings, based on the size of the property, and may help to address some of the issues that have come up in the agricultural district or other larger lots.

The township's ordinance works if the land is under $\frac{3}{4}$'s of an acre. If it is over $\frac{3}{4}$'s of an acre, this ordinance is not feasible. The township would like to allow for a second accessory structure more than 144 sq feet for larger lot sizes. The front yard setback should be the front yard building line. Consensus we would like some changes to the current ordinance about accessory structures.

7. **Home Occupations**—Home occupations are currently addressed in the ordinance as accessory uses—are there any thoughts or challenges for how home occupations are currently addressed or permitted? In home office vs home occupation was discussed. Most people apply for home occupations license for the tax right off. It is 10 percent of their square footage. No auto sales for home occupations. It is a pretty easy cut and dry process. No changes were proposed.
8. **Outdoor Storage of Cars/Boats/etc.**—The Township has indicated there are code enforcement issues with outdoor storage of vehicles, boats, etc. Would the Township like to see more specific standards prohibiting this and to what extent? Is it more applicable to outdoor storage of vehicles or boats that are for sale, or more relevant to storage of commercial vehicles on residential properties, etc.? The current ordinance was discussed. It is a nightmare for Code Enforcement. We can restrict the time a travel trailer can be parked in an area. We can have clear standards which would need Code Enforcement or we just don't allow them. A shortage of RV storage in the township was discussed. This use is only allowed in M-1 zoning. It is an ongoing issue. The consensus is the ordinance needs some work. For residential areas and possibly in limited instances in the B-4 zoning district.
9. **Non-Conforming Lots**—The Township included a note about non-conforming single-family lots (i.e. in terms of meeting setbacks for those properties. What would this ideally look like to the Township, if not requiring variances for these situations? (Note: there are not currently specific standards for nonconforming lots in the Ordinance). Discussion continued about tiny homes and lots. The consensus is nothing less than 1040 square feet and no changes to alter setbacks.
10. **Fences**—The Ordinance currently allows for 3-foot fences in front yards, except decorative fencing can be allowed up to 6 feet in commercial, manufacturing, and institutional districts with PC approval. Is the Township interested in allowing an exception for the Agricultural

district? (For example, there are some communities that allow taller fences in the front yard for larger lots of lots that have farm animals.

Front yard fencing looks bad. Ornamental fencing higher than 3 feet should be allowed as long as it isn't continuous in the front yard. 30 foot setback for residential and 60 foot setback for agricultural. If it is in the front yard, it must be 50% opaque. Lots of new ideas. Consensus is we have lots of options to think about. No specific changes were agreed to.

Other New Business: none

Old Business: none

Public Comment: No comments.

Adjournment:

Motion by Ms. McGraw, supported by Mr. Nolan, to adjourn the meeting at 7:28 p.m.

VOTE:	5 YEAS	0 NAYS	2 ABSENT (Nelson) (Fahndrich)	MOTION CARRIED
--------------	---------------	---------------	--	-----------------------